FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 191 *2 October 1985*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Pentagon Strategy on SDI, European Security [Bogachev] AA 1
SDI Risk Highlighted by Congressional Report [Kondrashov in IZVESTIYA 30 Sep] AA 2
Atlantis Shuttle Mission 'Purely Military' AA 4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Political Committee Session Postponed [TANJUG] BB 1
AFP: Pact Summit To Be Held in Sofia 21-23 Oct BB 1
Pact Forces Commander Kulikov Arrives in Sofia [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Oct] BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gorbachev Greets Space Flight Congress CC 1
PRAVDA International Review of Week's Events [Ovchinnikov, 29 Sep] CC 1

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Aim of Western Consultations Prior to Summit [Kornilov] A 1
Gromyko Receives Ferraro; Summit Discussed A 2
U.S. Congressmen Discuss Ecological Issues [IZVESTIYA 29 Sep] A 3

CHINA

Ilichev in PRC for 'Political Consultations' B 1
Ilichev: Prospects 'Bright' [AFP] B 1

SOUTH ASIA

Proposals for Indian Ocean Peace Zone Reaffirmed [Kharkov] D 1
U.S. Reporter Killed in DRA; Interference Goes On [Biryukov] D 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Gorbachev Address, Interview for French TV G 1
Message to Viewers G 1
[PRAVDA 2 Oct]
Interview With Journalists G 4
TASS Account G 12
Zagladin Interview on Gorbachev Visit to France G 22
[Prague]
Burlatskiy Previews Gorbachev Paris Talks G 23
[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 2 Oct]
Gorbachev Visit to France Expected to Boost Trade G 26
[Dadyants in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Sep]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Press Decries Beirut Kidnappings; Doctor Killed H 1
'Heinous Crime' H 1
Diplomats Identified [TANJUG] H 1
Envoy Meets Al-Jumayyil [Beirut] H 1
Physician Killed [Beirut] H 2
Further Reportage H 2
Israeli Planes Bomb PLO's Tunis Headquarters H 2
Khamene'i Shares Hope for Better Relations H 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Improper Use of State Vehicles Results in Waste R 1

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Delays Predicted in Soviet Oil to West S 1
[Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG 1 Oct]
Regulations on Incentives for Consumer Output S 1
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 14 Sep]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agro-Industrial Commission Session Review T 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 27 Sep]
Procurement of Feed Crops Ahead of 1984 Level T 2
[Glinka in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 21 Sep]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Gen Ivanovskiy Interviewed on Tank Troops Day V 1
[PRAVDA 8 Sep]

PENTAGON STRATEGY ON SDI, EUROPEAN SECURITY

LD012210 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 1 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

For several years now officials of the incumbent U.S. Administration are trying hard to convince the world public that the only dependable way to strengthening European security goes through the intensive deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in NATO countries and that the best way to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" is the militarization of space. This propaganda campaign has so far failed to meet Washington's expectations.

Former West German Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, a convinced Atlantist, admitted in a speech in New York yesterday that the Europeans thought the Soviet position on arms limitation and reduction more sensible. Even the highest echelons of government in the European NATO countries are seriously worried by Washington's plans to deploy an extensive anti-missile defence in the USA as it can tempt some hotheads to launch a nuclear war in the hope that the territory of the aggressor will be relatively secure.

Indeed, the deployment of large-scale space ABM defences is closely linked in U.S. scenarios to the development of such first-strike nuclear weapons as Pershing-2 and cruise missiles and to their deployment in West European countries. The adoption of a "Strategic Defence initiative" (SDI) by Washington does not at all mean that the United States has renounced the concept of a "limited" nuclear war. Conversely, almost simultaneously with the adoption of the SDI, NATO approved at the Pentagon's insistence revisions in its military concept of "flexible reaction" with emphasis on nuclear warfare away from U.S. territory. Under these "modifications" of NATO's strategy, U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe are to be used in the earliest stages of any conflict.

Reagan's "star wars" plan and the concept of a "limited" nuclear war in Europe are the basic components of the Pentagon's "countervailing stragegy." Even before Washington approved the SDI, the main thrust of that strategy had been to ensure that the consequences of any venture launched by Washington are paid for primarily by the Europeans. Now this emphasis in the "countervailing strategy" has been stressed dramatically by the U.S. "Strategic Defence Initiative."

The U.S. course of militarizing space in combination with the continued deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe is drastically escalating the risk of a catastrophic conflict in Europe. There is every reason to believe that, having shielded U.S. territory with extensive ABM defences and deployed medium-range missiles at the very threshold of socialist countries, the Washington administration will be "motivated" to pursue an even more adventuristic policy.

Though Washington's hopes to launch an act of aggression with impunity are totally illusory, the plans for "star wars" and a "limited" nuclear war are extremely dangerous to all the peoples of the world, including the American people. In the present-day situation, retaliation for aggression is unavoidable.

The way to stability in Europe lies not through the escalation of the race of nuclear and space weapons, as Washington seeks to prove, but through the limitation and reduction of armaments on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security for all the sides, and through the eventual complete removal of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons from Europe, as the Soviet Union suggests.

SDI RISK HIGHLIGHTED BY CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

PM011032 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Stanislav Kondrashov "Political Observer's Opinion": "Both Expensive and Risky"]

[Text] In addition to numerous committees and subcommittees, the extremely ramified institution called the U.S. Congress contains many different auxiliary subdivisions. One of them is the Office of Technology Assessment. No, nothing to do with domestic appliances, or vacuum cleaners, or even personal computers. The technology in question is linked with policy and military strategy, arises from them, and at times even leads them. The Office of Technology Assessment is called upon, in particular, to come to the aid of legislators whenever they are not quite certain as to what the various weapons systems, invented by indefatigable science for the service of war, will involve in the future.

This was the kind of expertise that was in demand a little while ago by two committees -- the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Even though the U.S. Congress has forked out about $3 billion for the first stage of the implementation of President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" in the next fiscal year, the people who sit beneath the dome of the capitol are perturbed by a difficult question: Where is their country being led, where could it end up? The report "Ballistic Missile Defense Technology" prepared by associates of the office was published last Wednesday [26 September]. On familiarization with excerpts from the report it becomes clear that it reflects the doubts and worries of many Americans. While maintaining objectivity and impartiality of experts, the report's authors nonetheless give a clear idea of how dangerous the future may become if the incumbent Washington administration were to go headlong into it with its "star wars" plans. They sense and perceive these dangers, even though they present them in evasive language.

For example, the report's authors have reached the opinion that SDI's "ultimate goals" can be attained only subject to "enormous success in the sphere of technology" (and many scientists doubt this possibility) and "a considerable degree of cooperation by the Soviet Union" (but who can assume this fantastic option -- the Soviet Union's cooperation in the achievement of military superiority by the Americans?!). As a result, the "ultimate goals" remain doubtful. Therefore, according to the report's authors, on the way toward these goals Washington will probably have to abandon the American-Soviet Treaty on Limitation of ABM Missile Systems, which is now instrumental in curbing the arms race.

President Reagan sought -- and to a certain extent obtained -- support for his "initiative" among ordinary Americans by promising a space shield to cover them from Soviet missiles. Furthermore, in order not to worry the aforementioned Americans, official explanations have ducked and continue to duck the other purpose of such a shield -- to enable America to deliver a first nuclear strike and protect it from retribution in the event of a retaliatory nuclear strike by the USSR. The experts on Capitol Hill deprive their compatriots of any illusions about the space shield's salvational nature. They note that, due to the lack of an agreement on the limitation of nuclear arsenals (and the chances of reaching such an agreement are reduced to zero by the very same "star wars" programs), the provision of total protection of the U.S. population against a mass nuclear strike is an impossible task.

President Reagan is trying to prove that the deployment of a large-scale ABM defense system will strengthen U.S. national security to such an extent that some kind of serene golden age will dawn for Americans following the nightmares of the nuclear age.

This argument also affects the mentality of the mass of ordinary Americans who, for generation after generation and for 200 years on end, have felt that their country is invulnerable to strikes from outside and would, of course, like to restore this enviable position -- and rid themselves of all worries. Not in conjunction with others, but by themselves, for themselves, and, if possible, despite the others -- this is the U.S. national security concept lurking behind the plans to create strike space weapons.

The experts working on the orders of Congress are by no means convinced that this is the correct way. They suggest a number of criteria which must be met by Washington's space designs before they are deemed expedient from the main viewpoint -- the strengthening of U.S. security. Will the world be less dangerous following the deployment of a large-scale ABM defense system in the United States? This is one of the criteria. The answer is provided by the present. No, and no again. The world has become much less comfortable even before the deployment of such a system insofar as U.S.-Soviet relations have become more complex and have deteriorated in the 2 and 1/2 years since the proclamation of SDI -- and largely thanks to it.

Here is the second criterion suggested in the report: The cost of the ABM defense must not exceed the price and risk of attaining the same goal "by other means." If "other means" were taken to signify a seriously and constructively developing process of nuclear arms limitation, the lowering instead of raising of the level of military confrontation, and the consolidation of confidence and political will for agreements, then there can be no doubt that they will be "cheaper" and will involve a far lesser risk.

Third criterion: The deployment of a large-scale space-based ABM system must not serve as an incentive to deliver a first strike. This criterion is not met by the plans for the militarization of space since they are aimed at rocking the strategic equilibrium between the United States and the USSR and threaten to render uncontrollable the already complex strategic situation.

The report "contains more questions than answers," its authors write. One gets the impression that it does not pose empty questions. And as for the answers or rather the main answer, it is contained in the following conclusion by the report itself: The implementation of SDI is fraught with the danger of the intensification of the offensive and defensive arms race and could create acute strategic instability. The outcome -- "risky consequences in the face of the unknown." To put it mildly....

The "star wars" subject is by no means new, but the degree of international attention to various problems is determined not by their novelty, but by their importance. Their importance and their potential danger. The "star wars" subject will not go away until -- and this is the best possible and most optimistic option -- the time when "star peace" reigns, in other words when outer space is free of weapons.

This subject is acquiring particular significance on the eve of the Soveit-American summit meeting. It is this subject which determines the degree of optimism or pessimism in expectations linked to Geneva.

In his interview with TIME magazine M.S. Gorbachev expressed the Soviet viewpoint most definitely: "Unless there is a ban on the militarization of outer space, unless an arms race in space is prevented -- there will be nothing else. This is our firm stance and this stance is based on our totally responsible evalutation, which takes into account both our own interests and the interests of the United States."

In one way or another the views of many sober-minded observers in the West agree with the Soviet evaluation. As one of them put it, the Washington administration's commitment to its SDI is the most solid guarantee that the arms race will survive into the 21st century.

Now the experts recruited by Congress testify that this commitment does not stand up to the test of logic or common sense.

A NEW YORK TIMES commentary says: "Doubts have been raised about the value of the presidential SDI in an extensive new study by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. Even Reagan's Republican supporters warn that support for his program is falling and that Congress will not give him carte-blanche."

But this is no reason to forget the other side of the coin. Highly influential conservative groupings from official Washington are firmly behind the "star wars" plans. They are still pursuing the goal of ensuring U.S. military superiority. Along their path to this objective they are stubbornly charging into space in order to hit the Soviet-American arms control talks as their first target.

Alas, these "hawks" will not yield to the power of normal logic disclosed at the junction of technology, policy, and strategy. They prefer their own particular logic of unceremonious strength even though it has nothing in common with the sensible view of their own country's interests and has repeatedly let them down in the past.

ATLANTIC SHUTTLE MISSION 'PURELY MILITARY'

LD011249 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] At the American spacecraft launching center on Cape Canaveral, the countdown has begun at 9 o'clock GMT before the launch of a reusable spacecraft on a purely military mission. The start of the Atlantis ship is scheduled for Thursday [3 October]. The crew consists of military officers whose task is to put in orbit secret military satellites. It is believed that the satellites will be part of the U.S. space system for tracking and guiding strategic missiles.

PACT POLITICAL COMMITTEE SESSION POSTPONED

LD011923 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1823 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, Oct 1 (TANJUG) - A session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries has been postponed again. No official explanation has been given so far, but unofficial reports say a term to suit all heads of state and party leaders is sought to convene the meeting this month. The regular session of the East European military alliance's highest organ was originally scheduled for last January 15-16 in Sofia but was postponed for an indefinite period due to Konstantin Chernenko's illness.

During a ceremony held in Warsaw last April to mark the 30th anniversary of signing the treaty, it was decided to hold the regular session of the Political Consultative Committee in Sofia in late September. It seems however that the term again did not suit all the member countries and the new one is now being sought. Unofficial sources say the committee will meet before the Gorbachev-Reagan meeting, since the session is a "component part of the preparations for the U.S.-Soviet summit."

AFP: PACT SUMMIT TO BE HELD IN SOFIA 21-23 OCT

AU011229 Paris AFP in English 1225 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Berlin, Oct 1(AFP) -- A Warsaw Pact summit will be held in Sofia from October 21-23, apparently to prepare for the November summit between leader Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, Western diplomatic sources said today in East Berlin.

Mr. Reagan has proposed a meeting of the seven major Western industrialised countries in New York on October 24. A summit of the seven Warsaw Pact countries was due to have been held in the Bulgarian capital at the start of this year, but was cancelled due to the illness of Soviet leader Konstantin Chernenko, who died in March.

PACT FORCES COMMANDER KULIKOV ARRIVES IN SOFIA

PM021106 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Friendly Visit"]

[Text] Sofia, 1 Oct -- Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, has arrived here on a friendly working visit.

He was met at the capital's airport by Army General D. Dzhurov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and Bulgarian minister of national defense, and other officials.

GORBACHEV GREETS SPACE FLIGHT CONGRESS

LD021033 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 2 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has sent a message of greetings to the first international congress of an association of the participants in space flights. The message says: "I want to convey my friendly greetings to the first international congress of an association of the participants in space flights. The very fact of the convocation of your congress is symbolic. It indicates that mankind vigorously enters the space era. The body of persons, who know what space is not by hearsay but from their own experience and who have cast a glance round our entire beautiful planet, is growing. It is natural that when matters concern space affairs your voice is heeded. It is important, of course, that this voice sound in favour of peace both on earth and in space."

"It is no secret to anyone that man's going out into space, which has been the realisation of his cherished dream, may turn out to be, paradoxically as it may seem, a mortal threat. The Soviet Union firmly comes out in favour of preventing a tragic course of events. Our alternative is close international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space for the benefit of the whole of mankind.

"You are already part of the twentieth-century history. The more tangible your contribution to serving the cause of peace, cooperation and mutual understanding among peoples can be.

"I wholeheartedly wish successes and wellbeing to the participants in the congress".

PRAVDA INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF WEEK'S EVENTS

PM010920 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] A Common Concern

The news of the catastrophic earthquake in Mexico has deeply moved people, reminding them of the frailty of human life confronted with the blind forces of nature. People have begun saying that modern science is still incapable of predicting such terrible natural disasters. Indeed, the mechanism of earth tremors is not yet thoroughly understood, nor is it controllable. But on seeing on our television screens the debris in the streets of Mexico City and rescuers removing human bodies from the ruins of collapsed buildings, you automatically think of something else. The unpredicatable violence of the natural elements is dreadful! But how much more appalling in its consequences is the catastrophe that man can cause today by pressing the button that launches nuclear missiles.

If science were able to predict or prevent a natural cataclysm of comparable destructive force, there can be no doubt that all countries and peoples would pool their efforts against such a disaster. And yet the possibility of thermonuclear disaster today is much more real, and its detonator is subject to human will. Moreover, an international mechanism specially created to prevent this threat exists.

The charter of the United Nations, which was created as a result of the victory over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism, enshrines obligations on the part of states to live in peace with one another as good neighbors and to unite together in combatting the threat of war. The United Nations has done much useful work in the last 40 years. But a great deal still remains for it to accomplish. For mankind is entering a crucial period when it must resolve the question of whether to live in peace or perish in nuclear war. Today, as in the years of the antifascist struggle, awareness of this common danger should impel states to rise above political and ideological differences and unite together to save mankind from nuclear death.

The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the United Nations as an effective instrument for peace, and persistently seeks to ensure that the just, democratic principles on which it was founded are implemented in the practice of international relations. This is precisely the stance from which our country approaches the United Nations' 40th anniversary session. This was evident in Soviet delegation head E.A. Shevardnadze's address to the General Assembly and in his speech at the Security Council's ceremonial session.

The main thing now is to prevent the militarization of outer space making the arms race uncontrollable and irreversible in nature. This is the aim of the USSR's proposal to include on the present UN session agenda the question "On International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in the Conditions of its Nonmilitarization." We must not repeat the error committed 4 decades ago when an outstanding scientific achievement, the release of atomic energy, was turned into a means of mass destruction. As a counterbalance to America's "star wars" plans the Soviet Union proposes to the international community the concept of "star peace" -- a program of extensive and equitable cooperation in outer space, including the setting up of a world space organization for the purpose.

From the UN rostrum and also in his meetings in New York and Washington this week with the U.S. Secretary of State and the U.S. President, the Soviet foreign leadership considers that the central task of the upcoming Soviet-American summit in Geneva must be to find mutually acceptable solutions aimed at halting the arms race on earth, preventing it in outer space, and strengthening strategic stability. A message from M.S. Gorbachev, which sets out his specific considerations and proposals regarding the November meeting, was conveyed to R. Reagan. They principally affect questions which are the subject of the talks on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva.

As was noted during the conversation between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Kadar in Moscow on 25 September, a turn for the better in international relations is really possible if the United States and its NATO allies renounce their plans to undermine the military-strategic equilibrium. The socialist community states are ready to step up their efforts to reduce miitary confrontation, improve the political climate in Europe and throughout the world, and revive detente.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France next week assumes great significance in this context. Practice shows not only that Soviet-French summit meetings serve as determining landmarks in relations between Moscow and Paris, but also that their significance goes beyond bilateral ties. The USSR and France were in at the beginning of detente and took the first steps toward overcoming the consequences of the cold war and toward new norms in relations among states with different social systems. The peace-loving public rightly considers that the traditional political dialogue between the USSR and France can help strengthen the positions of detente in Europe and throughout the world.

The Path to Security

The question of how to ensure Japan's security has been the topic of stormy debate in the country during September. Y. Nakasone's cabinet has approved the 5-year plan for military appropriations for 1986-90. Its distinctiveness lies, first, in the fact that, as opposed to past years, the document has been given the character of a binding government program. And second, in the fact that expenditure on military needs (amounting to more than $76 billion over the 5 years) will for the first time exceed 1 percent of the country's GNP. Thanks to relatively high economic growth rates, the Japanese military budget, even within this limit, has increased by 40 percent in the last 5 years. Now, however, when the "1-percent ceiling" is being breached despite the opposition of peace-loving forces, the country's rearmament could speed up.

Official circles in Tokyo are seeking to portray this move as a concession to Washington's demands. The Americans, it is said, are threatening to erect barriers to Japanese goods if Japan does not assume part of the U.S. military burden in the Asian and Pacific region. It is also thought that the accelerated buildup of military potential has been dictated not only by U.S. pressure, but by the cravings of chauvinist Tokyo circles. However, the enhancement of Japan's military role both within the system of the alliance with the United States and in the modern world as a whole poses a threat to the neighboring states of the Far East and Southeast Asia.

It is noteworthy that on the same day the Japanese Government approved the new 5-year military appropriations program, a mass student demonstration was held in Beijing. The participants in this procession marking the anniversary of the Japanese forces' invasion of northeastern China in 1931 called on the country's students to actively oppose the militarist trends in Tokyo's policy and the attempts to make people forget the Japanese military's crimes on Chinese soil.

The student demonstrations in Beijing and the critical statements from official PRC circles have caused alarm in Tokyo. After all, the Japanese authorities have already received enough trouble from criticism from another flank: The ASEAN states are seriously worried by the appearance of naval and air force "self-defense forces" outside Japanese territorial waters and national air space.

The discussion of Japanese security problems in connection with the latest 5-year plan for military expenditure coincided with a visit to the USSR by leaders of the country's largest opposition party -- the Japan Socialist Party [JSP]. The recently issued communique on the talks between the CPSU and JSP has provoked numerous responses from the Japanese public. According to the Japanese newspaper ASAHI, the Soviet side showed undoubted interest in improving relations with Japan. This was shown by the mere fact that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary talked with the JSP delegation for 4 hours. The Japanese have again been able to see for themselves that the USSR is in favor of continuing development of its relations with their country in the political, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and other spheres on the basis of good-neighborliness and mutual benefit. Moscow has repeatedly stated its readiness to take practical steps in this direction and would welcome a similar approach on the part of Tokyo.

The Japanese press is commenting from the same standpoint on the Soviet leader's message to Prime Minister Nakasone, which expresses the conviction that "the USSR and Japan must eventually find a common language" and also the hope that the Japanese Government will treat with due attention the recently submitted proposal on developing a comprehensive approach to security problems in Asia.

The Japanese press' responses to the Soviet initiative are not uniform. Doubts are voiced alongside positive statements: Will the idea of pan-Asian security, in the end, serve Soviet interests alone? But surely Japan, like the other countries, would benefit from the extension to the Far East of confidence-building measures in the military sphere on the pattern of those which became the practice in Europe after the Helsinki Conference? Surely an accord freezing the level of military activeness in the Asian and Pacific region, measures to ensure the security of sea lanes, or a commitment by all nuclear powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in Asia would be beneficial to Japan?

The participants in the talks between the CPSU and JSP were unanimous that the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of Asia, the Pacific, and the Indian Ocean would make a big contribution to improving the situation in the Far East. It was considered important that all the states of Asia without nuclear weapons should adopt the well-known nonnuclear principles (not to possess, manufacture, or import nuclear weapons) and the nuclear states should commit themselves to respect their status and never use such weapons against them.

Life provides more and more evidence that Japan's role in the international arena can grow in line with its contribution to the solution of urgent international problems and to the establishment of peaceful cooperation with all countries and peoples rather than on the path of militarizing the country and involving it increasingly closely in U.S. military plans.

AIM OF WESTERN CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO SUMMIT

LD011504 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 1 Oct 85

["What is the Aim" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 1 TASS -- political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

It has been announced in Washington that the U.S. President is planning to meet in New York on October 24 with the leaders of Britain, Italy, Canada, the FRG, France and Japan. Commenting on this announcement, a spokesman for the U.S. State Department said that the White House attaches tremendous significance to consultations with the friends and allies in the course of preparations for the Soviet-American summit meeting. Many Western observers are asking in that connection the question what specific aims are pursued by these "consultations," what the administration would wish to achieve by intensifying so noticeably political contacts with its partners on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting?

An answer to this question is given already today by the U.S. Administration itself, which as THE WASHINGTON POST points out, is doing its utmost to "demonstrate the unity of the allies." Realizing that by no means all people in the West support the policy of the USA, which continues banking on force, on preparations for terrestrial and "star wars" and that "star wars" remain according to the British GUARDIAN a problem potentially dividing the Western allies, Washington is trying in some cases to bring direct pressure to bear on the allies, in others -- lectures sovereign states what policy they should pursue, on how East-West talks should be conducted.

The latest example of this kind is the interview granted by the U.S. President to the French LE FIGARO, in which he tried, in actual fact, to present to the French leaders a pattern for the Paris-Moscow dialogue by declaring that it is "particularly important" that they in Moscow should understand that the NATO alliance remains powerful." [single quotation mark as received] As if the aim of the Soviet-French summit meeting is not a quest of ways for strengthening mutual trust and peace, but an act of advertising NATO, i.e. in the first place of the American military muscle.

Judging by press reports, the White House is planning to raise the same issues in the same or a very similar manner at the upcoming summit meeting of the seven. The Paris LE MATIN points out in this connection today that Reagan is out to use the meeting in order to "block" the USSR's policy, while the other French newspaper LIBERATION bluntly writes that the meeting should serve as some kind of a "warning" to the Western countries-allies of the USA.

In other words, the point is not so much "consultations" of the USA with its allies as to dictate to the partners on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting the line of conduct directed at supporting the militaristic policy of the USA.

It goes without saying that the bilateral relations of the USA, let us say, with France, the FRG, Japan or Britain is the business of those states themselves. Yet while watching precisely in what direction Washington has been recently intensifying its political contacts with the allies it is hard to rid oneself of the impression that certain circles in the USA are doing their utmost in an attempt to show distrust in the USSR's peace initiatives among the partners, that some people in the USA would wish to use the allies in order to lead things not to the success of the Soviet-American summit meeting, but in a diametrically opposite direction.

GROMYKO RECEIVES FERRARO; SUMMIT DISCUSSED

LD020918 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, received in the Kremlin today prominent American politician and public figure Geraldine Ferraro who ran for U.S. vice president from the Democratic Party in the 1984 election.

During their conversation Andrey Gromyko and Geraldine Ferraro exchanged opinions on some international problems as well as the present state of Soviet-American relations.

Andrey Gromyko stressed the crucial nature of the current moment in the Soviet-American relationship. International public opinion is looking forward with hope to the forthcoming meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President in Geneva. It is clear to any person that, without exaggeration, it is not only the security of the peoples of the two countries but also the development of the international situation in general that will largely depend on the results of the upcoming meeting.

The policy of the Soviet Union is fundamentally different from that of the United States. The main aims of Soviet policy are to prevent nuclear war, halt the arms race, reduce nuclear arsenals, prevent space from being militarized and strengthen peace. The policy of the American Administration is aimed at changing the strategic balance in the world in America's favor, so as to give the United States a dominant position and military supremacy over the USSR. That is the main aim of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of the United States, which is the mainfestation of an open policy of militarizing space. In the circumstances it would be in the best interests of all nations to find a way out by arriving at an agreement on preventing the arms race from being taken to space and putting the arms race here on earth to an end. The Soviet leadership believes it is necessary and possible to secure a turn for the better in the entire spectrum of Soviet-American relations, and above all in the all-important sphere of security.

In this connection Andrey Gromyko called Geraldine Ferraro's attention to the far-reaching initiatives advanced by the Soviet Union and this country's unilateral moves aimed at halting the arms race and strengthening international security. Regrettably, Andrey Gromyko went on to say, there have been no notable corrections in United States policy. But, as Mikhail Gorbachev has said, there is still some time before the summit and a great deal can be done in the run up to the summit to make sure that it [will] be useful and constructive and correspond to the wishes of the nations. The Soviet Union is prepared to cover its part of the road here, and that's where it is steering its policy.

During the meeting the Soviet side also touched upon the issue of trade and economic relations with the United States. At the moment these relations have been to all intents and purposes curtailed as a result of the deliberate policy of the American Administration to bring economic pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union continues to proceed from the view that the restoration and development of trade and economic relations would correspond to the mutual interests of the two countries.

Geraldine Ferraro spoke out for improving Soviet-American relations and securing their positive development. She said she viewed the forthcoming summit meeting in Geneva as an opportunity to bring about a breakthrough for the better in contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States and in improving the world situation in general.

As they concluded their conversation, both sides expressed satisfaction with the signs of a step-up lately in bilateral contacts and exchanges along political and public lines and voiced confidence that their development will help improve mutual understanding and strengthen trust among the Soviet and American people.

U.S. CONGRESSMEN DISCUSS ECOLOGICAL ISSUES

PM011316 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] Z.N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Commission on Environmental Protection and Rational Utilization of Natural Resources, received a group of U.S. congressmen led by M. Udall, chairman of the House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, on 27 September.

During a conversation which was held in a businesslike atmosphere, questions of environmental protection and the rational uitilization of natural resources were discussed. Practical measures to prevent environmental pollution as a result of anthropogenic activity were discussed in detail.

The U.S. delegation paid special attention to problems of economic intensification in regions of Siberia and also problems of social development; interest was shown in the experience existing here of environmental protection activity. The U.S. congressmen highly appraised the Soviet people's activity in transforming Siberia.

Taking part in the conversation were V.K. Mesyats, USSR minister of agriculture; A.I. Zverev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Forestry; and other leaders of Soviet ministries and departments.

ILICHEV IN PRC FOR 'POLITICAL CONSULTATIONS'

LD020847 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Text] Beijing, October 2 TASS -- Special representative of the Soviet Government, Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Leonid Ilichev has arrived today in Beijing for Soviet-Chinese political consultations. At the airport he was met by special representative of the Chinese Government, Deputy Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China Qian Qichen and other officials.

Ambassador of the USSR in the People's Republic of China Ilya Shcherbakov and also heads of diplomatic missions of a number of socialist countries, accredited in Beijing, were among the welcoming party.

The coming round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations is to begin on October 4.

Ilichev: Prospects 'Bright'

HK021102 Hong Kong AFP in English 1053 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Excerpt] Beijing, Oct 2 (AFP) -- Prospects are bright for improved Sino-Soviet relations and the two nations have agreed to exchange visits by foreign ministers, Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Leonid Ilichev said here today.

Mr Ilichev, who arrived here as special envoy for the seventh round of Sino-Soviet normalisation talks, told reporters "we believe the prospects (are) bright" for improved relations.

Asked about plans for the two country's foreign ministers to exchange visits, Mr Ilichev said "in principle we are going to have the visits."

Prospects of ministerial visits were reportedly discussed last week at the United Nations during the first meeting between Chinese Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, but no agreement was announced.

At a reception here Monday [30 September] to mark the 36th anniversary of the People's Republic of China, Mr Qian told Western reporters he expected "no breakthrough" from the seventh round of discussions.

The last round in Moscow in April ended with a joint communique expressing a mutual desire to develop bilateral relations in all areas, including the political arena. But on his return from the Soviet capital, Mr Qian said negotiators had made "no substantial progress."

PROPOSALS FOR INDIAN OCEAN PEACE ZONE REAFFIRMED

LD011723 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 1 TASS -- TASS commentator Vasiliy Kharkov writes: The Soviet Union has taken another important step towards the practical implementation of the idea of making the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, by reaffirming its proposals for all states using the Indian Ocean for navigation to refrain, even without waiting for an international conference on the Indian Ocean, which is slated to next year. To start, from making any moves that could complicate the situation in the region.

Those proposals were reiterated by Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, as he spoke in the Kremlin Monday [30 September] at a luncheon for visiting President Didier Ratsiraka of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar.

The Soviet initiative essentially aims to help fulfill a nearly 15-year-old decision of the United Nations which designated the Indian Ocean to be turned into a zone of peace.

It is the United States and its allies that are responsible for the fact that this important decision has not been carried out to this day and the planned international conference on the Indian Ocean has been put off again and again.

U.S. militarist expansion has been the main source of military tension in the Indian Ocean part of which has now been included in the U.S. "third strategic zone."

The new phase of American military presence there envisages, along with extending the web of bases to cover the whole of the ocean, installing nuclear-tipped cruise missiles on U.S. ships and aircraft as well as Pershing-2 missiles in some of the littoral states.

The Pentagon has been coordinating its military activities in the Indian Ocean with America's allies in NATO.

The "Rapid Deployment Force" is now Washington's main tool of military interference and pressure on Indian Ocean states.

The realization of Soviet proposals to refrain from sending large naval task forces to the Indian Ocean, holding military exercises there and expanding or modernizing military bases there could appreciably ease the current tensions in the region.

The Soviet Union recognizes the Indian Ocean's high significance to international shipping and the interest of all countries, including the United States, Western Europe and Japan, in the safety of the shipping lanes that pass across the Indian Ocean.

Now that practical preparations for the international conference on the Indian Ocean have been put on the order of the day, the urgency and importance of implementing the Soviet proposals is particularly clean. The fulfilment of the U.N. decision to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace would be an important factor in working out a comprehensive approach to security problems in Asia that would provide for pooling the efforts of all states there to achieve this highly important goal.

U.S. REPORTER KILLED IN DRA; INTERFERENCE GOES ON

LD012151 Moscow TASS in English GMT 1 Oct 85

["Victim of Washington's Policy" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 1 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

Charles Thornton, the 50-year old U.S. journalist from the city of Phoenix (Arizona), who ingloriously laid down his life in Afghanistan, will never rise from his own ashes like the mythical bird Phoenix. As a correspondent of the newspaper THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, Thornton left the city of Quetta, near Pakistan's north-western border, a month ago and with gangs of Afghan counterrevolutionaries sneaked into Afghanistan heading for the area of the city of Gandahar, AFP reports. But bandits, infiltrated into Afghanistan from Pakistan on U.S. money, are known to encounter effective strikes from the people's armed forces. Thornton and three other Americans did not escape this lot.

It was exactly near Qandahar that the uninvited guests met with the crushing fire of the Afghan Armed Forces, which killed Thornton and wounded one more U.S. journalist who, like Thornton, had left for Afghanistan in search of sensational reports from that country.

Thornton's death is direct sequel to the policy of covert and open interference, including military one, in the affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, pursued by Washington. Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA), said the other day in Kabul that the United States had set aside 600 million dollars for the undeclared war against the DRA in the last six months in addition to a billion dollars already spent on these ends. These dollars bring death and destruction to the Afghan people.

Being not content with the training of murderers and saboteurs for bandit raids in the DRA in special camps in Pakistani territory and the shipment of weapons to them, the Washington administration is busy stepping up the psychological warfare against Afghanistan, in which use in made of mass media both in the United States and the NATO countries, which is notorious for its taste for sensations. The U.S. Congress has recently passed the bill authorizing the release of half a million dollars to the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), the key establishment of the psychological warfare, conducted by Washington, for training Afghan counterrevolutionaries in methods of black propaganda.

This interference is gaining in scope. The "Free Afghanistan Radio" subversive radio station started broadcasting its anti-Afghan programmes from today. As expected, these programmes involved from the start a poorly frame-up falsehood which was immediately refuted by Kabul radio.

In disregard for the solidarity with the Afghan terrorists, demonstrated by Washington, and the growing U.S. aid to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries, with whose hands the undeclared war is being waged, the DRA people gives a befitting rebuff to their outside and internal enemies.

GORBACHEV ADDRESS, INTERVIEW FOR FRENCH TV

Message to Viewers

PM011518 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 85 p 1

["M.S. Gorbachev Address on French Television" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] In connection with his upcoming official visit to France M.S. Gorbachev received TF-1 television company journalists Y. Mourousi, A. d'Anvers, and D. Bromberger 30 September.

M.S. Gorbachev's message to French television viewers and his answers to questions from the TF-1 TV Company representatives are published hereunder.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen! Good evening, dear friends!

I am glad to have the opportunity to meet with French television viewers on the eve of my visit to your country. I confess that I am awaiting my new meeting with France and its people, political leaders, and public figures with great interest.

I share the view of the president of the republic that the upcoming meeting is special for many reasons. We will judge it by its results, of course, but I will say now: We are preparing for the meeting with a sense of great responsibility and for our part will do everything possible to ensure that it is fruitful.

As far as bilateral relations are concerned, we are convinced that the development of cooperation between the USSR and France is in keeping with both peoples' vital interests. The best proof of this is historical experience. When Russia and France, when the Soviet Union and France have cooperated, this has benefited them and likewise the whole of Europe and the entire world. And, by contrast, estrangement and enmity have harmed our national interests and had a detrimental effect on the international atmosphere.

The fact that Soviet and French people were brothers in arms in the struggle against fascism cannot be excised from history. We would be betraying the memory of those who died in that holy war if we were to forget how French airmen from the "Normandie-Neman" regiment heroically fought the fascists in the Soviet skies and how Soviet partisans did the same in the ranks of the Maquisards on French soil. Some 20 million Soviet people died in that terrible war -- dying for our freedom and yours. French people also gave their lives for your freedom and ours at that time. More than 20,000 Soviet antifascist soldiers lie buried in French soil. I know that their memory is revered in your country. The Soviet people are grateful to you for this.

But it is not only the jointly won victory that brings the Soviet and French peoples close together. The roots of our cooperation in many fields -- the economy and trade, literature and art -- stretch back deep through the centuries. All this bears witness to the durable foundations, fine traditions, and deep roots of our relations. Their development and consolidation -- and I say this with great confidence -- is in our common interests. It is very important not only to continue but to deepen the dialogue, concord, and cooperation between the USSR and France.

It seems to us that on the whole our relations are developing quite well [neplokho]. The volume of trade has quadrupled in 10 years. We are satisfied at this and believe that it also benefits France. But economic ties could be more active and diverse. This is what we believe. The same applies to cooperation in science and technology, an impressive symbol of which was the joint flight by Soviet and French cosmonauts. Our exchanges in the field of culture and education, tourism, and public contacts are fruitful.

I hope that the upcoming Soviet-French meeting will lend new impetus to the development of political, trade and economic, scientific and technical, cultural, and other relations between the Soviet Union and France. But we regard this meeting as a major event not only in bilateral relations. Harmony and cooperation, as the principles of Soviet-French relations stated in 1971, are called upon to be a "permanent policy in their relations and a permanent factor in international life."

The exacerbation of the international situation was yet another reason for the urgency of my meeting with President Mitterrand. There is little that is concoling in what is happening in the world today. At any rate, if you judge by actions and not words, international tension is growing. The threat of a nuclear missile catastrophe is not lessening. It is necessary to face up to this bitter truth. Mountains of weapons have been accumulated, but nonetheless their production and modernization are being accelerated. Europe is literally crammed with military bases and instruments of death. Today it is not enough to describe it as a "powder keg." It is a far more explosive concentration of the latest means of annihilation. But even this is not enough -- colossal new arms programs and extremely dangerous strategic concepts are being feverishly elaborated and implemented, although Europe is simply too small and too fragile for power politics. The same goes for our whole planet earth, incidentally.

I am speaking of all this because I believe that today no one has the right to be a detached observer of what is happening. So much mistrust and suspicion have accumulated in the world that it will clearly take considerable efforts and time to clear the obstructions. But without this, without what I would call an appropriate psychological reorientation and, of course, without political will, it will be difficult, if indeed possible at all, to change the situation for the better. The fate of every nation and every man -- whether he is an ordinary citizen or a political leader -- is now being decided in foreign policy.

In order to survive and to ensure a future for our children and grandchildren it is necessary to curb the forces of madness, the forces of war and militarism. The fire of war must be extinguished before it flares up.

Can this be done? We believe it can. We already have positive experience on which we can rely -- the successes of detente. These retain their vitality. The consistent observance of all provisions of the Helsinki Final Act can again improve [ozdorovit] the climate in Europe and dispel the clouds that have gathered over the continent.

Voltaire once dreamed of the triumph of reason as a necessary condition of normal human communal life. This summons by a great son of France is especially topical today, when the crossbow and the sword have been succeeded by nuclear weapons. We will have time to find out whose ideology and whose views and laws are more moral and whose economy is more rations. History is long enough to ensure that the peaceful competition between ways of life provides people with the opportunity voluntarily to make their choice themselves and to decide which social system is more to their liking. Yes, we are different, but what can you do -- that is what history has decreed.

As for the Soviet Union, it is doing and will continue to do everything to ensure that it lives in peace with states belonging to other systems. Furthermore, this is the very principle which underlies our approach to the solution of international problems. It is also the principle that guides us in domestic policy.

Briefly about our affairs. Today there are about 277 million people living in the Soviet Union. Historical experience has convinced us that Russia's peoples made the right choice in 1917 by carrying out the revolution and destroying exploitation and social and national oppression.

Soviet people are proud of their country's achievements and particularly of the fact that for over 50 years now the country has not known unemployment, that the right to work is enshrined in the constitution and backed by a system of corresponding social and economic measures. The state budget has no deficit.

Out people, just like any other, want to live better and are pleased that real per capita incomes have doubled over the last 20 years while the prices of basic foodstuffs have not risen. Over 2 million apartments are built in our country each year. Housing is made available free of charge and apartment rents account on average for 3 percent of the family budget. People's health and their spiritual development will remain our paramount concern. Let me note that we have succeeded in accomplishing a considerable among here. The country has almost 6 million engineers, 1.5 million scientific workers, and over 1 million physicians. A system of free public education and health care has been established and is functioning.

The Soviet Union unites more than 100 nations and ethnic groups. One of the main gains of the revolution was the affirmation of the principle of equality of peoples in all spheres of society's life. At the time of the revolution many of the 15 unions and 38 autonomous republics were in the situation of backward outbacks. Now they not only enjoy equal economic and political rights but have also developed their own powerful economies and have scored great successes in science, culture, and education.

Soviet people are aware not only of their achievements and successes but of their weaknesses and shortcomings. You may possible know that all this is discussed widely, openly, and on a democratic basis in our society. We deem it important to focus attention on precisely the unresolved problems and are striving to accelerate the country's economic and social development and improve the people's life. We react sharply to remissness, disorganization, and irresponsibility if they are committed by people placed in high positions. And of course, we devote paramount attention to ensuring strict observance of the norms of social justice, citizens' democratic rights, and Soviet laws.

All these efforts are approved by our people -- moreover, the people demand of us leaders that precisely such a line be implemented. I know this also from many thousands of incoming letters and from my personal meetings and personal contacts with hundreds and hundreds of Soviet people.

To put it briefly, we are well aware of the existing problems. Some questions have been or are being resolved. Others require time, resources, and persistent efforts. We are currently tackling in earnest questions of scientific and technical progress and of improving the management of the economy and economic management methods. We have the potential to resolve the new tasks. This potential includes highly skilled cadres, natural resources, and the scientific and production potential. But the main element is the broad support for the political course by all strata of the population. We are planning to submit further measures to improve matters for nationwide discussion.

In general, we will come to our forthcoming 27th Party Congress with a specific action program for the improvement of Soviet society and with plans for the forthcoming 5 years and [the period] through the end of the century. We are looking with our mind's eye, so to speak, to the 3d millennium. Broad prospects are opening up. Suffice it to say that in industry alone we must do as much over the next 15 years as we have accomplished in almost 7 decades of Soviet power.

I am talking about all this not only in order to familiarize French television viewers with our everyday deeds and concerns. I think it is important for people in France and other countries to have a clear idea of our system of priorities. If the main thing for us Soviet people is to develop the economy, social relations, and democracy, this also determines our interests in the international arena and our foreign policy interests.

First and foremost the interest in peace and a stable international situation making it possible to focus attention and resources on peaceful creative matters.

We are resolute opponents of the arms race on earth and resolute opponents of transferring it to space. It is necessary to put a stop to this dangerous process and immediately get down to disarmament. I want to stress that we not only make statements but also act in this direction. We have unilaterally renounced the first use of nuclear weapons and introduced a moratorium on the holding of any nuclear explosions. We have halted the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. We have declared to the entire world that we will not be the first to take weapons into space. Our country is also prepared for other radical solutions.

And what happens? Try to consider without prejudice what is being done and said in response to our initiatives. New nuclear explosions have been held, antisatellite weapons have been tested, and distrust of our initiatives is being feverishly excited. One cannot escape the impression that some people have been gripped by fear at the very possibility of accords in Geneva and at the fact that it may be necessary to reduce weapons production and moderate military appetites. But, as the saying goes, we shall see what we shall see. We have ample patience. Although I must say frankly that all this is very far removed from a quest for ways of improving the international situation.

As you can see, many alarming and urgent questions have accumulated in the world. I intend to discuss them with the French president in the most serious manner. I hope that our dialogue will be fruitful. I am convinced that the Soviet Union and France have a real opportunity to make a tangible contribution to the cause of mutual understanding and cooperation among the peoples. It is with this hope that I am going to France.

On behalf of Soviet people I wish everyone listening to me now, all French men and women and all French families, happiness, prosperity, and peace.

Interview With Journalists

LD020145 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Interview given by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev to French TF-1 television journalists Alain Denvers, Yves Mourousi, and Dominique Bromberger in the Green Room of the Kremlin on 30 September, journalists questions in French with superimposed Russian translation -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Question] Mr Gorbachev, allow me to thank you for receiving us. We are glad to meet you irrespective of the views to which you adhere. You are a man of the this era, a man of your time.

[Gorbachev] I hope this conversation like -- I am finding it difficult to express myself -- not just the decades but already the centuries of relations between our countries, will take place in a spirit of mutual understanding and, first and foremost, with a feeling of the traditional friendship that is a feature of our relations -- both between Russia and France and between the Soviet Union and France. There have been clouds, but I do not recall any particular storms. Probably you all recall how the history of our relations has been. But all the same, they are relations which, if you imagine a tree with deep roots, reach back into past centuries. And it is a tree that produces good fruit for our peoples and, I think, for international relations in general also. But any tree, and especially an old one, needs to be looked after so that the tree bears fruit -- today and tomorrow -- good fruit and plenty of it.

[Question] Are you aware that not everything will take place easily during your visit to France? Our questions to you on the international situation lie ahead. But now, we must say that you are awaited in Paris with both interest and, I would say, also with a certain wariness. They want to see what kind of a person Mr Gorbachev is. Evidently, questions will be touched upon concerning not only Soviet-French relations in the sphere of defense policy, but also questions concerning human rights.

[Gorbachev] Your question may be answered at length, or briefly. Why am I going to France on my first foreign tour, if we are speaking of Western countries? I attempted to answer this question in brief in my address to the television viewers. Of course we take into account, we recognize, that there is evidently strata, a part of the French population that perhaps does not even like the fact that in such a... [5-second pause]. Perhaps I will even put it more directly. Perhaps they do not like the fact that our relations are acquiring such a nature. They are acquiring dynamism, they are progressing and gaining strength. I am thinking of political dialogue. Economic links are expanding; traditional cultural links are gaining strength. We depart on the premise that this corresponds to the fundamental interests of the Soviet people, and corresponds to the fundamental interests of the French people. And this is the determining factor. All the rest is detail.

No doubt in French society there are those who are critical of us. I think that perhaps they would like to weaken these trends in the development of Soviet-French relations. But we are aiming at them, too [ina nikh oriyentiruyemsya]. And I repeat: We are going to France because we think that this corresponds to the fundamental interests of France and the Soviet Union, and corresponds to the fundamental interests -- on the whole, in the international situation -- the interests of other peoples. Energetic political dialogue is needed now as never before, in order to remove the accretions of years gone by.

We are different. That is so. We have different political systems. We have different views of human values. But we also have much in common. And I think above all of the fact that we have a shared concern of living in this real world, and of finding ways to cooperate, to work together in various spheres. And, taking into account that today we all experience anxiety in connection with the growth of the thrat of nuclear conflict, in connection with the arms race, we simply have a need, a demand for such an exchange, for a discussion of the issues. And I think that, this being the case, France is a very important partner for the Soviet Union. And, this being the case, taking these very considerations, this understanding as our point of departure, we are setting off for France.

[Question] Mr General Secretary, there has undboutedly been a cooling period in Soviet-French relations. I am thinking of the 80s, 1983-84. This was a temporary period and it is receding into the past, but doesn't something still remain?

[Gorbachev] Let's look into the future. And let's fill our relations, our political dialogue, our economic and trade cooperation and our cultural exchange, with a new content, and expand our cooperation, and find and bring out our common interests and possibilities for joint action, for parallel action in the interests of France and the Soviet Union, and in the interests of other peoples.

You know, as long ago as 1922 Vladimir Ilich Lenin said a sentence which I wrote down for myself, and decided that I would definitely tell you today. Perhaps I should have said it when I was answering the first question, why we are going to France. These are the words that Lenin said then: I don't know if you know them, but I don't think they will lose their value for being repeated -- "Drawing closer to France is extremely desirable for us." That was said in 1922. I think that the importance of these words of Lenin, and the thought that is contained in them remains intact today, too.

[Question] Irrespective of what government there is in France?

[Gorbachev] You know, each people decides for itself what government to have. Respecting the sovereignty and the sovereign right of every people is something we have to take that into account in our foreign policy and in our relations. We have great confidence and respect for the people of France who are our friends, and with the government in power today, or the government which will be in power tomorrow; we shall continue to try to maintain our relations and to develop them.

There are periods perhaps in the relations between states, when things cloud over. In this case, when we are speaking of Soviet-French relations, I would rather concentrate attention on what brings our people closer together. I think that this is the capital which allows us to build with confidence today's relations, and to look ahead with confidence in the search for reserves to activate our relations. I think that will be in the interests of our countries, and of benefit to the world. Let us look ahead.

[Question] Mr. Gorbachev, you recently met Mr. Marchais. Is it not a paradox that at a time when the French Communists have left the government, when they criticize the activity of the French Government, you are making your first visit to France to Mr. Mitterrand?

[Gorbachev] What happens in France, is a matter for the French, their internal affair. I know that both groups of parties that are leading the country today, I mean the Socialist Party and those forming a block with them, as well as those in opposition, to some extent or the other, with shades of differences, they all support the development of Soviet-French relations, on the basis of tradition, on the basis of the experience accumulated over the years. I think this is a responsible position. This is how we also act. Every effort to draw closer together with France, Lenin said, is desirable.

[Question] It seems that you support good relations with all social democratic governments of Europe?

[Gorbachev] As regards the issues that today concern the peoples of the world, I have in mind the questions of war and peace. We have recently been cooperating actively with social democratic parties. Also you probably noted that among the meetings and talks I have had in recent months, a large proportion was made up of talks with delegations of social democratic parties. We think that our ideological differences are not an obstacle to cooperating in the solution of such topical issues as the question of war and peace. And on our side we say this openly.

We have good relations, useful relations with the social democrats of West Germany, the Socialist Party of Japan, Sweden, Finland, Austria. We always take up their proposals, take part in their congresses, and at a fairly high level, Moreover, we are open to cooperation with all forces which are interested in overcoming the dangerous trend in developments in the world situation and leading the world onto the road of cooperation, joint action, and mutual understanding.

[Question] Recently it seems as if you have been showing special interest in Europe. Is this impression true, and if so, what is the reason for this?

[Gorbachev] I think that the Soviet leadership has in its foreign policies always kept in mind questions of Soviet-European relations, and its relations with the countries of Western Europe. I would even say kept them at the focus of its attention.

This can be explained. You and I live in this Europe. I think that Western European countries are also no less interested in developing these relations. At any rate, in my opinion the Soviet Union does not occupy a smaller place in their foreign political affairs than they occupy in the Soviet Union's foreign policies. We live on the same continent. We have certain traditions. We have a history from which we draw some kind of lesson, and we learn from this history. At any rate, Europeans have no need to borrow wisdom. Whatever aspects of the development of mankind's civilization we look at, the European contribution is great. And since we live in the same house, we need to cooperate and adjust communications in this house, even though some go into that house through one entrance, and others through another entrance. In my opinion it is natural that the Soviet Union attaches important significance to cooperation.

[Question] That is a very De Gaulle-like approach.

[Gorbachev] I shall not discuss with you now who has priority. But if we were to look backward and now swiftly review our foreign policy activities since the Great October Socialist Revolution, you would all see that all the time the issue of interaction, of cooperation, of adjusting relations with West European countries, has always had an important place in the Soviet state's foreign policies. In my view, certainly before De Gaulle appeared -- a great figure on the political scene.

[Question] Even so, the reaction is not always the same. And in fact when certain employees at Soviet establishments were forced to leave France on espionage charges, no special reaction was noted in the Soviet Union. But when Britain recently accused a group of Soviet employees of espionage, that time the Soviet side's reaction was forceful and energetic. One got the impression that the Soviet Union was acting according to the principle "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." Well, are there good and bad Europeans?

[Gorbachev] I think that you will grant the Soviet Union the right, a sovereign right which belongs to it, to in each case make the decision it thinks necessary. And in this case we consider both the interests of the Soviet Union, the general interest, and the general situation.

[Question] What is your view of the European "Eureka" project?

[Gorbachev] I want to go to Paris and find out in more detail what the "Eureka" project is all about. And maybe we can continue an exchange of views on this question later in Paris.

[Question] In other words you prefer the "Eureka" project to the plans for the so-called "star wars," the SDI, a priori, in a manner of speaking?

[Gorbachev] A priori, I, we, prefer the nonmilitarization of space to the militarization of space. This is the most important point. If the "Eureka" project pursues peaceful aims, and this is precisely what we want to find out during our visit through talking with the President and other representatives of France, then we will weigh our attitude on this project.

[Question] Did you put forward any new proposals in your letter to Reagan?

[Gorbachev] Yes.

[Question] What kind of proposals are they?

[Gorbachev] I think that the Americans have told you the main part. They always call on us to do everything in a confidential manner, but they have patience for no longer than the end of the meeting.

As soon as the contacts have been completed, then the whole world finds out within 10 minutes what happened at that confidential meeting. At any rate they already know the essentials. And so you probably already have an idea. But I think that we will talk more about this in France.

[Question] The issue in question is a 40 percent reduction in the nuclear arms arsenals, isn't this so?

[Gorbachev] I will wait a little before replying to this question because of the moment these problems are bing set out in Geneva, and I would not like to reply to your question before our delegation at the Geneva talks has fully explained our proposals.

[Question] What do you think? Will your forthcoming meeting with Reagan in Geneva be anything other than, anything more substantial, than just a meeting to get to know each other?

[Gorbachev] Well, in any event, this is precisely how we are approaching it. I have already tried to express this idea quite definitely, that it would be a great luxury for the leaders of such countries as the USSR and the United States, in the present situation, which is tense -- I shall say frankly, without trying to dramatize things, but the situation is tense -- when all the peoples of the world are awaiting specific and constructive steps and primarily from the great countries, for us to go to Geneva in order to exchange handshakes, to have a look at each other and to smile nicely for the television -- by the way, quite a lot of correspondents will probably be sent there.

We invite our partners, I mean the President of the United States and his colleagues to carry out a sound preparation for our meeting in Geneva so that both during the preparations and during the meeting itself, to lay a sound foundation in the building of future peace will be laid. Peach must be built by proceeding from realities. We have our interests, France has its interests, the United States has its interests. But who has said that the other states of the world do not have their interests? But all of these interests collide on the international arena. To suppose that the present-day international arena is an arena only for the actions of some particular country or group of countries is an incorrect notion of the contemporary world. I think that much stems from this misunderstanding. Reality must be taken into account, it is a serious thing.

[Question] Mr. General Secretary, of late you have displayed a considerable amount of pessimism. In particular, in your message to the French people you said that the threat of nuclear catastrophe was not diminishing. And in your interview somewhat earlier you repeated that a situation could arise when it would be too late to change anything and that an explosive situation was arising in the world. In your reasoning in this vein you refer mainly to SDI, but SDI is a project for the distant future. So, in connection with this, I would like to ask the following question: Why, in view of well-known facts evidencing a certain stabilization of the situation, now, from your point of view, has the threat to peace become greater than before?

[Gorbachev] Good question. Good in the sense that this is the most important question that needs to be answered right now. When we say that we have reached a point beyond which events can start that could get out of control, this is not a display of pessimism, it is a display of the responsibility by the Soviet state and its leadership, its political leadership, for the fate of the world. It is disadvantageous to some for the peoples to be aware of the situation as it really is. But this is really as it is. As a result of the development of science and technology we have now reached the stage when the arms race could be transferred into space. We have reached the stage when weapons could be invented, even nonnuclear ones that are capable of acting like nuclear ones, with equal depth and equal effectiveness, if it is possible to speak of effectiveness here.

Frankly speaking, it is already very difficult for us to begin talks. You have probably noticed that there is under way a sort of militarization of political consciousness. And what will happen if tomorrow the process of the militarizing space starts up, if strike space weapons are created? What should the logical response of the other side be to all of these plans? Well, by no means to start disarming in the sphere of strategic weapons and other nuclear weapons. It will have to seek possibilities for withstanding this challenge. The way the situation is developing must be looked straight in the eye. These are very serious things. They must not be camouflaged with -- excuse me -- demagogy, when in essence it is a question of the fate of the peoples and the fate of the world. Therefore, processes might get under way which will complicate altogether the possibilities, which will cut off the possibilities of seeking a peaceful settlement of the problems.

If someone goes out into space, then such limitations as the antimissile defense agreement, the strategic arms treaty, and other will go out the window. Therefore, we have really reached a very responsible stage in the development of the international situation. This is not a pessimistic position but a true assessment of the real situation and it is dictated by the need to seek solutions to lead the development of international relations onto a different road, the road of peaceful cooperation, and to put a stop to the arms race -- that is, to set in motion a search for ways to reduce nuclear weapons and eliminate them.

And I must say that this is not just a matter of the position of the USSR and the United States; other countries also have a responsibility. Now, there must be no sitting on fences; it is necessary to take a position; the times demand that every responsible government or politician who today has been placed by fate, as it were, at the head of some state or other, should take a specific position on these questions.

[Question] Let us return to matters in Moscow. You have now held the post of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary for several months and some see you as a figure for the coming quarter of a century. What, in your view, would you now like to change in the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] Besides what I have already said, which is known in France, too, it is hard for me to add anything. We assess the situation in the country as follows: On the one hand, we have traveled a long way and achieved enormous economic, social, and political progress. That's how we assess it. In this enormous country -- a backward country from the point of view of the development of the economy and education; a country populated by many peoples -- we have managed in a short historical period, according to historical scale, historical measure, to implement our major plans. But now we are not satisfied with it. This is probably logical if one bears in mind that, along with the development of man himself, his needs also increase; not just the material ones, but also the cultural and spiritual ones. And our society should be changing to fulfill these needs to an ever greater extent. The socialist system allows us to ensure greater dynamism both in the economy and in the social sphere, the spiritual sphere. This is the main thing for which we are toiling at present.

[Question] In the eyes of many you appear to be a man of change. If you indeed are a man of change, why is it that in the Soviet Union there are no changes on the question which, it seems to us, somewhat undermines the Soviet Union's reputation abroad: the question of human rights. In June 1984 Mitterrand for the first time pronounced the name Sakharov officially and quite loudly. If one is to add Shcharanskiy's case here and if one is to consider the campaign in France to enable Soviet Jews to leave the country at will, why shouldn't all this be taken into consideration? It could also become evidence of certain changes.

[Gorbachev] I do not want to limit myself to a formal reply, although I could do just that. Although it is not formal, in essence I would say this: Let us run things in the Soviet Union and you run things in France. But all the same, I will answer your question. First of all, I would like to say that the question of human rights does not present any difficulty for us. We are ready to discuss this question anywhere, with any audience, and any representatives. Furthermore, we do have things to say on this question. I think that we see that at present this question is being artificially inflated and made use of for poisoning relations between peoples and states.

And I would -- and if a discussion were to begin now, and if the French side in this instance was represented, say, by you, and there was somebody for our side, we would find something to say on this question. We would first of all present you with arguments to show that things are not like athat at all. And if it were different, Mr Mourousi and your colleagues, it would not pass in the Soviet Union. Our people are very sensitive to that.

As far as economic and social rights are concerned, we could show in what state things are in the Western countries, in the most highly developed ones, including France, and how things are in our country. I am not citing facts for the time being, but I have them. As far as political rights are concerned, I could show that in our Supreme Soviet there are more workers and peasants than in all the developed countries' parliaments. It would be interesting to conduct an experiment for 6 months or a year, to put workers in the parliaments of your countries, and then we would take a look at the situation. It would be interesting to watch. But workers are not admitted there, whereas in our country they constitute the majority everywhere -- from a rural soviet to the Supreme Soviet.

You will say that there are facts, there are people who, by virtue of this or that logic, have found themselves at odds with the Soviet power, with socialism; they profess other ideology. Problems arise when this or that individual comes in conflict with the law. And in this case Shcharanskiy...this is precisely what happened to Shcharanskiy. He broke our laws, and you know which ones.

Your speak of the Jewish question. If anywhere else, in any country, Jews enjoy such political and other rights as in our country, I would be very glad to hear about it. It is not to be found anywhere. The Jewish population, which constitutes 0.69 percent of the entire population of the counter, has 10 to 20 percent of the participants in the political process, in the cultural process.

When questions of reuniting families arise, we go along with it. We go along with it and solve the questions. When do we not solve them? When there is a problem connected with being privy to state secrets, then we allow this process to settle, as they say. Those in our country who for 5 to 10 years have been unable to get a permit to leave -- where there really is such a need in order to reunite -- eventually get it and leave. Doesn't France also have legislation that restricts, protects state interests? It has. I know it. And we will continue calmly, in a human manner, to solve these questions.

[Question] May I ask another question? It is true that there are 4 million political prisoners in the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] It's absurd! [pause] That's like some type of Goebbels propaganda. Well, I'm surprised that an educated, modern man like you, Mr Mourousi, who understands the processes going on in the world, could even ask that question. [pause] It's absurd!

[Question] Mr Gorbachev, you seem to be professing a new style of communication, a new style of leadership. We are now, as it were, discovering you for ourselves. Tell me, is there such a thing as the Gorbachev style? And if so, how would you define that style?

[Gorbachev] I don't think there is a Gorbachev style, there is not a Gorbachev style. I've already spoken about this. If we are speaking about the methods of our work, and in particular about my, so to say, approach, the style of my work, then this is not something that appeared yesterday or 2 or 3 months ago. I have worked this way all my life. It was always like this. And I know that many of my colleagues work exactly in this fashion. It fits the framework of the style that we cultivate in our party and describe as the Leninist style of work. It is this that is linked, these methods of work, these principles of action, based on communication]obshchenie], openness [glasnost], on studying, on contacts, wide contacts with the working people, on studying the real processes that can nourish politics and find their reflection in policies -- all this is what Lenin implanted in the Communist Party. We try to emulate that, because I am a fervent supporter of just that approach. The example of Lenin is the best one, and we are following Lenin's path, and using his style.

[Question] Together with you, Mr. Gorbachev, a new generation of Soviet politicians [deyateli] has come into the leadership. At the end of last week, for example, it became know that there also have been changes at the head of the Soviet Government. What new things, other than a new style, could the new generation of Soviet leaders bring to your country?

[Gorbachev] I think that what is happening is a normal process. So there is nothing extraordinary about it. Every generation makes its contribution to progress, to the shaping of values, both political and spiritual. And I think the present generation of leaders in the Soviet Union will make its contribution. I think this will be connected with broad, large-scale work on improving socialism. We know what has to be done in order to open up even more the best aspects of this social system. And at the center of all our aspirations is man and his needs. But I would say that we do not look upon socialism, upon our society as a consumer society. We don't follow the standards of the Western way of life here. But what is useful and enriching and may also enrich our society we will make use of on the basis of exchange with other countries. Active efforts will be made to lend more dynamism to our economic system, our political system, and to the system of socialist democracy. And above all, attention will be paid -- the closest of attention -- to ensuring that the importance of the human factor is fully used and fully revealed.

[Question] You are going to Paris and if you have a spare evening, what would you prefer to do? Visit the Picasso museum? See Shakespeare's "Julius Ceasar"? Go to a concert or the opera? What are your predilections?

[Gorbachev] Since I know the schedule and I won't have a spare day or evening, I won't be faced with this problem. whenever you visit another country it is interesting to learn about its past, but I must say that I have a certain feeling of a sort of moderation with regard to the past. I am at least, even more, interested in life today, in every society, in every country and people, and in their probelms, their traditions and their interests. Probably that is natural for a political worker.

[Question] Mr. General Secretary, we probably still have a thousand questions, but we must end our interview. It has already been quite lengthy. Yet again, allow me to thank you for giving French television this exclusive interview.

[Gorbachev] I was glad to meet the representatives of French television. I think our conversation with you will make it possible to judge that we can meet, that we can discuss calmly, all questions. And I believe such an approach to the discussion and solution of the greatest problems that worry our people can yield good results.

We have an interest in the further development of relations with the people of France, our friends, and for our part we will make the necessary efforts. But naturally, such a cause demands reciprocity. We must meet each other halfway. It is from this piont of view that we regard our upcoming visit. It will be a good chance to raise our relations and open prospects for the future. Thank you.

TASS Account

LD011919 Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 1 TASS

On September 30, Mikhail Gorbachev received Yves Mourousi, Alain d'Anvers and Dominique Bromberge [names as received] journalists of the French Television Company TF-1, on the occasion of his upcoming official visit to France.

Follows the text of Mikhail Gorbachev's address to the French television viewers and his replies to the questions of representatives of the television company TF-1.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen

Good evening, dear friends.

I am glad to have an opportunity to meet the French television viewers on the eve of the visist to your country. I must say that I am looking forward with much interest to the new meeting with France, her people, political leaders and public figures.

I share the opinion of the president of the republic that the forthcoming meeting is of a special character for many reasons. We will certainly, judge it by its results, but now I will say that we are preparing for the meeting with a sense of high responsibility, and, on our part, will do our utmost for it to be fruitful.

As far as bilateral relations are concerned, we are convinced that the development of Soviet-French cooperation accords with the vital interests of both peoples. The best proof of that is historical experience. When Russia and France, the Soviet Union and France cooperated, this served the best interests of both of them, just as of the whole of Europe and of the whole world for that matter. And, on the contrary, alienation and enmity were detrimental to our national interests and adversely affected the international atmosphere.

One cannot strike out of history the fact that Soviet people and Frenchmen were brothers-in-arms in the struggle against fascism. He would betray the memory of the fallen in that sacred struggle, if we forgot how the French pilots of the regiment "Normandi-Neman" heroically fought against the fascists in Soviet skies, and the Soviet partisans fought in the ranks of the Maquisards on French soil.

Twenty million Soviet people died in that terrible war, they died for our and your freedom. Frenchmen, too, sacrificed their lives for your and our freedom. More than twenty thousand Soviet anti-fascist fighting men are buried in France. I know that their memory is revered in your country, the Soviet people is grateful to you for that.

But it is not only the joint victory that brings the Soviet and French peoples closely together. Our cooperation in many fields -- in the economy and trade, literature and the arts is deeply rooted in centuries. All this is indicative of the good fundamentals, good traditions and deep roots of our relations.

Their development and strengthening, and I am saying it with great confidence, serves our common interests. It is very important not only to continue, but also to deepen the dialogue, accord and cooperation between the USSR and France.

On the whole, as it seems to us, our relations are shaping quite well. The volume of trade has grown four-fold in ten years. We are gratified by that. And I believe this also serves the best interests of France. Yet the economic relations could be more active and diversified. This is our belief. The same goes for cooperation in science and technology, whose impressive symbol was the joint flight of Soviet and French cosmonauts. The exchanges in the field of culture and education, tourism and public contacts are fruitful.

I hope that the forthcoming Soviet-French meeting will give a fresh impetus to the development of political, trade, economic, scientific, technical, cultural and other relations between the Soviet Union and France. But we view this meeting as a major event not only in bilateral relations. Accord and cooperation, as it was recorded in the principles of Soviet-French relations in 1971, are designed to become a "permanent policy in their relations and a permanent factor of international life."

Another reason of the urgency of my meeting with President Mitterrand is the worsening of the international situation. There is little consolation in what is happening in the world today. At any rate, judging by deeds rather than by words, international tensions are growing. The threat of a nuclear missile catastrophe is not lessening. We must face this bitter truth. Mountains of arms have been stockpiled. Yet their production and modernization are being stepped up. Europe is literally crammed with military bases and deadly weapons. Today it is no longer enough to say that it is a "powder keg." It is a much more explosive concentration of the latest means of destruction of human beings. But even this proves to be not enough: new gigantic armament programs and most dangerous strategic concepts are being feverishly drawn up and implemented, although Europe is too small and too fragile for the from positions of strength policy. As, for that matter, is the whole of our planet -- the earth.

I am saying all this in the belief that today nobody has the right to be a passive onlooker of what is going on. So much distrust and suspicion have accumulated in the world that it will, perhaps, take quite a lot of effort and time to remove the road blocks. But without that, without an appropriate, I would say, psychological change of attitude, and, certainty, without political will it will be difficult to change the situation for the better, if possible at all. The destiny of every nation, of every person, whether an ordinary citizen or a political figure, is being decided in foreign policy now.

To survive and to ensure a future for our children and grandchildren it is necessary to curb the forces of madness, the forces of war and militarism. The flames of war should be put out before they flare up.

Can it be done: We believe that this is possible. We already have positive experience, on which it is possible to base ourselves -- the successes of detente. They have preserved their vital force. A consistent observance of all provisions of the Helsinki Final Act can again improve the climate in Europe and clear away the clouds, which have gathered over the continent.

Once Voltaire dreamt of triumph of reason as an indispensable condition for normal human life. This call by the great son of France is particularly topical today, when the crossbow and sword have been replaced with nuclear weapons. We will have enough time to find out whose ideology, whose view and laws are more moral and whose economy is more rational.

History will have enough time for a peaceful competition of ways of life to ensure for people an opportunity to make a voluntary choice, on their own, to determine what social system is more to their liking. Yes, we are different, but nothing can be done about that, such is the will of history.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is doing and will further do everything in its power in order to live in peace with the states belonging to other systems. Moreover, this is precisely the principle which underlies our approach to the solution of international problems. We are guided by that also in our home policy.

Now I will speak in brief about our domestic affairs. About 277 million people live in the Soviet Union now. Experience of history has convinced us that the peoples of Russia made the right choice in 1917 by accomplishing the revolution, by destroying exploitation, social and national oppression. The Soviet people are proud of their country's achievements, in particular, the fact that for more than 50 years now there has been no unemployment in the country. And the right to work is enshrined in the Constitution and is secured by a system of corresponding social and economic measures. There is no deficit in the state budget.

Our people, just like any other one, wants to live better and is gratified that in the past two decades real per capita incomes have doubled, and that prices of staple foodstuffs did not increase. More than two million apartments are built in the Soviet Union every year. Housing is provided free of charge, and the rent accounts for three per cent of a family's budget, on an average. The health of people and their spiritual development will remain our major concern. Mind you, we have succeeded in achieving a good deal in this field. There are more than six million engineers, 1.5 million scientific workers, and more than a million physicians in the country. A system of free public education and health care has been established and is functioning.

The Soviet Union integrates more than a hundred nations and nationalities. The assertion of the principle of the equality of peoples in all spheres of society's life was one of the principal gains of the revolution. Of the 15 union republics and 38 autonomous administrative units, many were in the position of backward outlying regions at the time the revolution was accomplished. Nowadays they not only enjoy equal economic and political rights but have also created their powerful economies and have made great strides in science, culture and education.

Soviet people see not only their achievements and successes but also their weaknesses and shortcomings. You possibly know that all that is discussed in our society widely, openly, on a democratic basis. We consider it important to focus attention precisely on unsolved problems and are striving to accelerate the economic and social development of the country and to improve the people's life. We keenly react to negligence and irresponsibility. And, of course, we devote prime attention to seeing to it that the norms of social justice, the democratic rights of citizens and Soviet laws be strictly observed.

All these efforts are approved of by our people -- moreover, the people demand of us, leaders, that we pursue precisely such a line. I know this from many thousands of letters from people and from personal meetings and contacts with hundreds and hundreds of Soviet people.

To put it in a nutshell, we know the existing problems well. Some questions have been or are being solved while others require time, resources and persistent efforts. We have now fundamentally taken up the questions of scientific and technical progress, and of improving economic management and management methods.

We have the possibilities to solve the new tasks. These are both highly-qualified cadres, natural resources, and the science-based production potential. And the main thing is that the political course is widely supported by all sections of the population. We intend to bring up further measures aimed at improving the state of affairs for discussion by the whole people.

On the whole, we shall come to our party's forthcoming 27th Congress with a concrete programme of action to perfect Soviet society and with plans for the coming five years and for the period lasting till the end of the century. We will peer with our mind's eye into the third millennium. The prospects that are opening up are vast. Suffice it to say that the amount of work which is to be done in industry alone in the forthcoming 15 years is equal to that which we have done over the almost seven decades of Soviet power.

I am telling this not only for the sake of acquainting French TV audiences with our everyday work and cares. It seems important to me that in France and other countries people should have a clear idea of the system of our priorities. If the main thing for us Soviet people is to develop the economy, social relations, and democracy, this also determines our interests in the international arena and our foreign-policy interests, above all the interest in peace and in a stable international situation, which would make it possible to concentrate attention and resources on peaceful creative work.

We are determined opponents of the arms race on earth and of transferring it to outer space. It is essential to stop this dangerous process and to set about tackling disarmament without delay. I want to emphasise that we not only make statements but we also act precisely in that direction. We have unilaterally renounced a first use of nuclear weapons, have introduced a moratorium on any nuclear explosions, and suspended the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. We have told the whole world that we shall not be the first to make a stride into outer space with weapons. Our country is ready for other radical solutions as well.

And what of it? Just try without bias to think what is being done and said in reply to our initiatives. New nuclear explosions have been carried out, an antisatellite weapon has been tested, and a feverish drumming up of distrust of our initiatives is under way. It is impossible to get rid of the impression that some people have been frightened by the very possibility of accords in Geneva, and the prospect that the production of weapons will have to be curtailed, maybe, and military appetites moderated. But as a saying goes, we shall see what we shall see. Our patience will suffice us. Although I want to say frankly -- all this is very far from a search for ways to improve the international situation.

As you see, quite many questions have accumulated in the world -- disquieting and urgent ones. I intend to discuss them with the president of France most seriously. I hope that our dialogue will be fruitful. I am convinced: The Soviet Union and France have a real possibility to make a tangible contribution to the cause of mutual understanding and cooperation among peoples. It is with this hope that I am going to France.

On behalf of Soviet poeple I wish all the TV viewers, all men and women of France, and all French families happiness, prosperity and peace.

The best wishes to you all.

A. Why do I go to France on my first foreign visit to the West? I have already tried briefly to answer this question in my address to T.V. viewers.

We are aware, of course, that there are likely to be people in France who, perhaps, even frown at the way our relations are shaping up -- and they are becoming dynamic, making progress and gaining momentum. What I have in mind is both political dialogue and the broadening of economic ties and traditional cultural contacts. We proceed from the assumption that this meets the vital interests of the Soviet people and the vital interests of the French people. This is the decisive thing and the rest are particulars. Perhaps, there are those in France who criticise us. I think that, perhaps, those critics would even like to detract from these good tendencies in the development of Soviet-French relations. But it is not to them that we are looking. I repeat, we are going to France because we think that this meets the vital interests of our countries, the goals of improving the international situation as a whole, and hence the interests of other peoples. Today we need more than ever before an active political dialogue to remove the overlayers of past years. We are different, true, and have different political systems and different views of human values, but we also have much in common. First of all, I think, what we have in common is a desire to live in a real world and to find ways to work together and cooperate in different fields, all the more so since all of us are worried today by the escalation of the threat of nuclear conflict, by the arms race. We have a need, a real necessity in such exchanges and in discussing various questions. And I think that France is a very important partner for the Soviet Union in this sense. It is proceeding from these considerations and this understanding that we are going to France.

Q. Mr. General Secretary, Soviet-French relations undoubtedly saw a period of cooling up -- I mean the years 1983 and 1984. Was it an interim, a thing of the past, or will something of it survive?

A. Let us look ahead, and fill our relations, our political dialogue, our economic and trade cooperation and our cultural exchanges with new contents, broaden our co-operation, find and identify our common interests and possibilities for joint or parallel actions in the interests of France and the Soviet Union, in the interests of the other peoples.

You know, way back in 1922 Vladimir I. Lenin said words which I have written down and decided to quote for you today. Perhaps, I should have done so when I answered your first question, why we are going to France. Lenin said in 1922: "Any rapprochement with France is extremely desirable for us..."I think that the meaning of these words of Lenin and of the idea carried by them effectively holds true today as well.

Q. Regardless of what government France will have?

A. You know, every people decides for itself what government to have and, respecting the sovereignty, the sovereign right of every people, we must reckon with it in our foreign policy. We have much trust and respect for the friendly people of France, and will seek to maintain and develop relations with the incumbent government, and with the government which may come into office tomorrow.

There are periods in relations between states when something darkens. In our case, when we discuss Soviet-French relations, I would concentrate more on what brings our peoples closer together. I think that this is capital which enables us confidently to build today's relations and confidently to look ahead and to energize our relations. This, I think, will promote both the interests of our countries and the cause of peace. Let us look ahead.

Q. Recently you met Mr. Marchais. Is not it paradoxical that when the French Communists have withdrawn from the government and when they are criticising the French Government, you are paying your first visit to Mr. Mitterrand in France.

A. I do not think it is. What is taking place in France is the business of the French, their internal affair. I know that those political forces which are governing the country today -- I mean the Socialist Party and those who are allied with it -- and also those who are in opposition stand to one extent or another for the development of Soviet-French relations on the basis of traditions, on the basis of experience accumulated over the years. I think that it is a responsible position. Our approach is the same.

Q. It seems you are having excellent relations with all the social democratic governments in Europe.

A. We have been energetically cooperating with social democratic parties during the past few years in questions which today are worrying the peoples of the world -- I mean questions of war and peace. You must have noticed that conversations with delegations of socialist and social democratic parties have accounted for a sizeable share of my meetings and conversations during the past few months.

We think that our ideological differences are no obstacle to cooperation in tackling such urgent questions as questions of war and peace, and we for our part openly say so. We have good relations and maintain useful contacts with the Social Democrats in West Germany, Sweden and Finland and with the socialist parties of Japan and Austria. Generally speaking, we are open to cooperation with all the forces which have an interest in reversing dangerous tendencies in the development of the world situation and in leading the world onto the road of cooperation, interaction and mutual understanding.

Q. You seem to have been showing special interest in Europe lately. Is this impression true?

A. The Soviet leadership has always kept in sight questions of our relations with West European countries in pursuing its foreign policy. I would even say, in the focus of attention.

This is understandable. You and we live in this Europe. I think that West European countries have a no smaller interest in developing relations with the Soviet Union and that the Soviet Union is no less prominent in their foreign policies than they are in Soviet foreign policy. We have some traditions. We have history, from which we draw some lessons, from which we are learning. Anyway, the Europeans will not be found wanting in wisdom. Whatever aspect of the development of human civilization we take, the contribution made by the Europeans is immense. We live in the same house, though some use one entrance to it and the others another. We need to cooperate and to develop communications in that house. I think it natural that the Soviet Union attaches much importance to this cooperation.

Q. Gaullist approach? [question as received]

A. I will not now take issue with you over who should be credited with priority. The question of interaction, cooperation and establishment of relations with West European countries has always played a substantial role in Soviet foreign policy. It had been so long before De Gaulle, a major figure in politics, emerged.

Q. Yet reaction to the actions of Western countries may vary. Indeed, when some number of officials of Soviet institutions were accused of spying and asked to leave France, no special reaction came from the Soviet Union. But when the British recently charged a group of Soviet officials with spying, the reaction of the Soviet side was strong and energetic. One has got the impression that the Soviet side acts according to the principle "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Do you divide the Europeans into good and bad?

A. I think you will reserve for the Soviet Union the sovereign right to take decisions on every case as it sees fit. In so doing, we take account of both the interests of the Soviet Union and of the overall situation.

Q. What do you think of the European project known as Eureka?

A. I want to go to Paris and to learn in detail about Eureka. Perhaps, we will continue in Paris later an exchange of opinions on this question.

Q. Speaking a priori, do you prefer the Eureka project to the "star wars" plans of the Strategic Defense Initiative?

A. A priori, we prefer non-militarization of space to its militarization. This is the main thing. If the Eureka project is pursuing peaceful goals -- and this is just what we want to clarify in our conversations with the president and with other French officials -- we will think over our attitude to that project.

Q. You have written a letter to Reagan. Have you put forward any new proposals?

A. Yes, we have.

Q. Could you tell us anything about these new proposals?

A. I think the Americans have already spoken about the main things. They always call upon us to do everything in confidential meetings but their patience lasts them only as long as a meeting lasts. As soon as a contact is over, the world learns within 10 minutes what has taken place at that "confidential meeting." At least, it learns the basics. That is why you must already have an idea of this matter. But I think that we will yet have discussions in France on this subject.

Q. What all this amounts to is a 40 percent reduction in the nuclear arms arsenals, does it not?

A. I'd put off answering this question. These problems are now being presented in Geneva, and I would not like to answer your question before our delegation to the Geneva talks has presented our proposals in their entirety.

Q. Do you think that your forthcoming meeting with Reagan in Geneva in a few weeks can become something more than just a get-acquainted meeting?

A. It would be too great a luxury for the leaders of such countries as the Soviet Union and the United States of America in the present-day tense situation, with the peoples of the world expecting concrete, constructive steps primarily from the great powers, to go to Geneva just to exchange a handshake, to look at each other and to smile pleasantly in front of T.V. cameras. We are inviting our partners -- I mean the President of the United States of America and his colleagues -- to make thorough preparations for our meeting in Geneva so as to lay already during those preparations and at the meeting itself solid bricks into the edifice of future peace. We must build peace -- but a different peace and different relations -- proceeding from realities. We have our own interests, France has hers, and the United States of America also has interests. But who can say that the other states of the world have no interests? And all those interests are clashing on the world scene. To think that only one country or group of countries can act on that scene means to have a wrong idea of today's world. I think that much is caused by this lack of comprehension. Realities must be reckoned with; they are a serious matter.

Q. Mr General Secretary, you have lately been showing some signs of pessimism. You said in your address to the French people that the threat of nuclear catastrophe is not abating. Also, you said in one of your interviews yet earlier that, perhaps, it would be too late, and that the world situation was growing explosive. Talking in this way, you meant mostly the SDI. But the SDI is a thing of the future. Why then do you think that the threat to peace now is graver than it was?

A. This is the main question, which must be answered precisely now.

When we say that we have reached a point beyond which events may get out of hand, it is not a sign of pessimism. It is a manifestation of the responsibility of the Soviet state and its leadership for the destinies of peace. There are those who stand to lose if the peoples' realize the situation as it is. But we have now reached a point as a result of scientific and technological progress when the arms race can spill over into outer space. We have reached a point when weapons of new types, not even nuclear but no less awesome and efficient, if we may talk about efficiency in this case, can be developed. Frankly, it is very difficult to begin talks already now. You must have noticed that a sort of militarization of political consciousness is taking place. And what happens if the militarization of space begins tomorrow and if space strike weapons are developed? What should the logical answer of the other side to such actions be? By no means the beginning of disarmament in strategic weapons and other nuclear systems. We should face realities squarely and see how the situation is shaping up. These are very serious matters and they must not be camouflaged with demagogy, excuse my saying so. As a matter of fact, the destinies of the peoples, the destinies of peace are at stake. There may emerge processes which will altogether block possibilities for seeking a peaceful settlement of problems. Ways must be looked for to counter that challenge.

If anyone introduces weapons in outer space, such constraints as the ABM treaty, the accord on the limitation of strategic weapons and others will go overboard. That is why we have really approached a very critical point in the development of the international situation. It is not a pessimistic position but a realistic appraisal of a real situation. And it prompts a need to look for solutions so as to lead the development of international relations onto a different road, onto the path of peaceful cooperation, to stop the arms race, to begin reductions in nuclear armments and eventually to eliminate them. And I must say that the matter hinges not only on the position of the Soviet Union and the United States of America -- other countries also bear responsibility. Today it is impossible to sit it out on the sidelines -- one must take a stand. The times demand that every responsible government or politician destined, so to speak, to lead one state or another should today take a clear stand on these issues.

Q. You have been general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee for several months now. Some people view you as a leader for the next quarter century. What would you like to change in the Soviet Union already now?

A. I can hardly add anything to what I have already said and what is known in France as well. We view the situation in the country as follows. On the one hand, we have travelled a great road and made immense economic, social and political progress. We have managed in an historically short period of time to carry out major plans and to introduce deep-going changes in that vast country, once backward from the point of view of the economy and education and populated by many peoples. But we can no longer be satisfied with this. Perhaps, this is logical if we bear in mind that as man develops, his needs, both material and cultural and intellectual, keep growing.

Our society must change so as to meet these needs to an ever growing extent. The socialist system enables us to ensure greater dynamism in the economy, in the social sphere and in the cultural and intellectual sphere. This is the main goal towards which we are working now.

Q. You are seen by many as a man of change. Why then are there no changes in the Soviet Union in the matter which, we believe, is in a way damaging to the reputation of the Soviet Union abroad, namely, in the matter of human rights. The names of Sakharov and Shcharansky are mentioned in France and a campaign is being conducted so that Soviet Jews could leave the country if they wish. Why not take all this into account?

A. I could put it as follows: Let us in the Soviet Union manage our affairs ourselves and you in France manage yours. But I will nevertheless answer your question. The issue of human rights is no problem to us and we are ready to debate it anywhere, in any audience and with any representatives. We have what to say on this issue [as received]; which is now being artificially played up by Western propaganda and exploited to poison relations between peoples and states.

As regards first and foremost economic and social rights, we could demonstrate the state in which they are in the most developed Western countries, including France, and the situation in our country. Relevant facts are common knowledge. As for political rights, I could say that our Supreme Soviet has more worker and peasant deputies than all the parliaments of the developed capitalist countries put together. It would be interesting to stage an experiment, at least for half a year or for a year, and send workers to the parliaments of your countries. We would then see what happens. But workers, as a rule, are kept away -- but in our country they are in key positions everywhere, from rural soviets to the Supreme Soviet.

Of course, we have people which by virtue of some logic or another have fallen out with the Soviet form of government, with socialism, and profess some different ideology. Problems in such cases arise when one individual or another comes into conflict with law. That was what happened to Shcharansky mentioned by you. He breached our laws and was sentenced by court for that.

You mentioned the "Jewish question." I would be glad to hear of Jews enjoying anywhere such political and other rights as they have in our country. The Jewish population, who account for 0.69 per cent of the entire population of the country, are represented in its political and cultural life on a scale of at least 10-20 per cent. Many of them are people well known in the country.

When it is the matter of the reunification of families, we agree to this and settle such questions. There are exceptions when individuals in point know state secrets. But does not France have legislation protecting the interests of the state? It does, and I know this. We will continue to resolve these questions without fuss, on the basis of a humanitarian approach.

Q. And the last question, just in passing: Is it true that there are four million political prisoners in the Soviet Union?

A. It is absurd! It calls to mind, you know, Goebbels's propaganda. I am amazed that you, Mr Mourousi, an educated and up-to-date man could ask such a question. I repeat: it is absurd.

Q. Mr. Gorbachev, you seem to be practicing a new method of communication, a new method of leadership. Is there a "Gorbachev style"? If there is, how could you define that style?

A. I think, there is no "Gorbachev style." I have already said so. Discussing methods of our work, in particular, the style of my work, it is not something which appeared yesterday or a month, two or three ago. I have been working like this all my life. And many of my comrades are working precisely like this.

The style we are cultivating in our party we define as the Leninist style of work. It is characterized by such things as extensive communication with the working people, publicity in work, and analysis of real processes which underlie policy making. It is everything which Lenin taught our party. I am an enthusiastic champion of precisely this approach. The example set by Lenin is the best possible example. We are following the road of Lenin and using his style.

Q. A new generation of Soviet leaders have risen to power along with you, Mr Gorbachev. For instance, at the end of last week we heard that the Soviet head of government had been replaced. What this new generation of Soviet leaders could give your country in addition to style? [Question as received]

A. I think what is taking place is a normal process. There is nothing out of the ordinary in it. Every generation is making its contribution to progress, to molding political, cultural and intellectual values. I think that the present generation of leaders in the Soviet Union will make their contribution. This will concern primarily large-scale work to perfect socialism. We know what must be done in order to bring out to a fuller extent the best aspects inherent in that social system. And it is man with his needs who is the centerpiece of all our aspirations.

But I would say that we do not view socialism as a consumer society, we will not follow the standards of the Western way of life. But we will make use of what is useful.

Every effort will be taken to make our economic system, our political system, the system of socialist democracy more dynamic. Attention, the closest attention possible will be attached primarily to bringing out the importance of the human factor in full measure.

Q. You come to Paris the day after tomorrow and if you have an evening off what would you prefer, going to the Picasso Museum, seeing Shakespear's "Julius Caesar," enjoying a concert, listening to an opera -- in short, what is your preference?

A. Since I know the program and since it does not give me an evening off, let alone a day off, I have no such problem.

But generally speaking, when you visit another country, it is always interesting to learn also about its past. But I must say that I have no less interest -- or even more interest -- in the present-day life of every society, every country, every people, their problems, traditions and interests. Perhaps it is natural for a politician.

Question: [format as received] Mr General Secretary, we would have, probably, a thousand other questions but we must conclude our interview. We want to thank you again for granting this exclusive interview to French television.

M.S. Gorbachev: I was happy to meet with representatives of French television. I think our conversation with you makes it possible to say that we can meet, that we can calmly discuss all questions.

We are interested in a further development of relations with the friendly people of France. This is a matter that requires reciprocity. We must move towards each other. It is from this viewpoint that we regard our forthcoming visit as well. This is a good possibility for raising our relations and showing their prospects for the future.

ZAGLADIN INTERVIEW ON GORBACHEV VISIT TO FRANCE

LD012135 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Interview with Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, by permanent correspondent in Moscow Stefan Babiak; date and place not given -- recorded in Russian with superimposed Czechoslovak translation]

[Text] [Babiak] France is the first capitalist country which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will visit. Vadim Valentinovich, how should we, in the current tense international situation, assess this?

[Zagladin] It is precisely in the tense international situation of today, that the visit to France assumes exceptional importance. Why is France the first capitalist country which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will visit as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet? The answer to this question seems a simple one to me. France is a country with which we have long had traditional ties. In many periods, our countries have cooperated very fruitfully, above all, in the struggle against war, fascism and in the 1950's and 1960's both countries to a great extent contributed to and in fact started the process of detente. And we would, naturally, like to continue in these traditions. And another point we have to note is that the French Government, the French leadership -- despite the fact that in its policy there it is, naturally, various [word indistinct] and we cannot agree with everything -- is on the whole advocating a reduction of tension, the coexistence of states with different social systems, and the reduction of arms levels. On the basis of this, we can hope that we will be able to arrive at some common conclusions. And France, of course, is Europe; the role of Europe, West Europe as a whole, in international politics has increased considerably and it is understandable that from France it is possible to turn to Europe with ideas and concepts about the future of our continent.

[Babiak] Vadim Valentinovich, how does the Soviet Union view France's attitude to the American "star wars" plans?

[Zagladin] French President Mitterrand, speaking 2 years ago at a UN General Assembly session, said quite unequivocally that France is against the militarization of space. The statement (?in its essence) has been repeated in speeches by the (?prime minister) and minister of foreign affairs of that country. We have, however, also heard other views. Discussions of this topic are being conducted in all Western countries. In recent months, the French stand against the militarization of space or against the excessive armament in space, as the French call it, has been stated repeatedly. We hope that nothing will be changed on this stand. There is now a situation such that in any international talks conducted at present the problem of the prevention of militarization of space cannot be avoided. And of course, it will also be discussed there.

[Babiak] What does the Soviet Union expect from the forthcoming visit for the development of economic and other forms of cooperation with France?

[Zagladin] In the economic sphere, cooperation between us and France is quite well developed; a so-called grand commission has been set up and is functioning quite well [words indistinct]. There is also a minor commission which will, by the way, meet in Paris shortly after the visit by Comrade Gorbachev to Paris. We have concluded long-term agreements which on the whole are being fulfilled; the volume of trade is growing fast. The present level of development already shows some possibilities for the future. We, of course, meet with certain complications. The signed programs and the programs which are being drafted are quite extensive and offer great possibilities but they are not always fulfilled evenly. The reason is that in a number of cases limitations imposed from outside are in operation -- France observes them for various reasons. It could also be that competition and rivalry between some firms could be having an effect. To sum up: more could be done, there exist reserves and we are convinced that economic relations after the visit will become more dynamic.

BURLATSKIY PREVIEWS GORBACHEV PARIS TALKS

PM020814 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Oct 85 pp 1, 14

[Article by political observer Fedor Burlatskiy: "On the Eve of the Paris Meeting"]

[Text] What does the Soviet public expect from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to France and his talks with Francois Mitterrand?

The following can be said in an attempt to provide a brief answer to this question. Primarily we expect a new impetus to the development of Soviet-French relations -- political, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural. Then we would like this meeting to serve as a catalyst for the entire European process -- the substantial improvement of relations between European socialist and capitalist countries in the spirit of detente. And finally, we would like Paris to provide a more favorable backdrop for the turnabout in mutual relations between East and West as a whole. The 40th UN General Assembly session, currently sitting in New York, is also called upon to contribute to such a turnabout. The speech by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze at the session emphasizes our country's profound interest in the resumption and consolidation of the easing of international tension and outlines an extensive program for overcoming confrontation for the sake of the flourishing of civilization all over the globe.

Moscow-Paris

Soviet-French cooperation became a factor of worldwide significance a long time ago. We recall very well that it was this cooperation that marked the start of the process of detente in the sixties and infused more and more strength in it in the seventies. Of course, the skies above us have not always been cloudless; problems have arisen from time to time in our relations, but it is perhaps difficult to find an example of more stable mutually advantageous relations between countries with different social systems. The Soviet people value the achievements and want to march further and further along this path.

Through joint efforts over the last 15 years we have established an extensive system of relations between us based on a firm political and legal foundation. The volume of trade trebled on the basis of the economic cooperation agreement for 1975-1979 and continued to grow thereafter. The remarkable gas for pipes project, signed in January 1982, became the harbinger of a new and extensive program for our cooperation.

Of course, the two sides have still far from exhausted their potential in the sphere of economic, scientific, and technical exchanges. It is thought that the Paris talks will make a contribution in this direction.

I believe that the Soviet-French meeting could serve the cause of all-European integration. Let this occur primarily in the sphere of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. Let the "Common Market" and CEMA pave the way to mutually advantageous cooperation. Let the cultural achievements in both parts of our continent become the property of all Europeans. And of course, this process must be assisted by the easing of confrontation between the two military blocs -- NATO and the Warsaw Pact -- and the termination of the arms race.

The European Process

The 10th anniversary of the Helsinki Conference confirmed the durability of the gains of European detente, despite the exacerbation of tension between East and West as a whole. And of course European cooperation could not avoid the effect of the chill winds of confrontation blowing from across the Atlantic. But the foundation laid in 1975 was made of the lasting material of mutual interests; it has withstood, and detente itself has displayed its high degree of viability even during frosty periods.

The French people, just like the entire world, can see and know the enormous efforts applied by the Soviet Union to boost the economy and effect its technological modernization. This requires not simply the preservation of peace but the easing of tension, detente, and the curbing of the arms race. Such an atmosphere creates the best opportunities for all countries' economic and social progress. And now is the time when Europe itself can mark the beginning of a new chapter in international relations. Our country supports the growing influence and role of West European countries in world politics as a whole for the sake of peace and detente.

I must admit that I shudder whenever mention is made of the two Europes -- East and West. Two social systems -- this is something understandable. But two Europes? Absurd! This has never been the case. This is not the case. Nor will it ever be. We belong to one all-European civilization which is rooted in the culture of antiquity, the titans of the renaissance and of modern times -- Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, Shakespeare and Moliere, Cervantes and Balzac, Goethe and Heine, Tolstoy and Dostoyevskiy. The existence of the two military blocs is incapable of erasing this fact, which reflects the history of dozens of generations of Europeans.

But even these relatively trivial thoughts are not the point. The point concerns something else, too. All of Europe today is inseparably linked by a common nuclear fate. The Europeans are perfectly aware that not a single one of them will manage to survive in the event of a nuclear war. This probably applies to the entire world, but it applies mainly to us Europeans. And if this is so -- and it is indisputably so -- then the Europeans, primarily the Europeans, regardless of whether they live in the east or in the west, must take their fate in their own hands.

There is another consideration which applies to the present moment: The new technology, characterized by minicomputers and information technology, by new optics and materials, offers in effect immense opportunities for the modernization of all types of existing weapons -- nuclear missiles and conventional weapons -- and for the creation [sozdaniye] of new and even more unbelievable types.

I must say that the "Eureka" project suggested by the French Government initially aroused my interest. I had always imagined that economic, scientific, and technical integration in Europe would not be capable of confinement within the "Common Market" framework and that sooner or later it would spread throughout Europe. Furthermore, "Eureka" was founded on the principles of independence, cooperation, and peace, and it promised an alternative to the military use of space. This could have offered good opportunities for technological integration on the continent had it not been for....

Had it not been for the appearance of alarming features providing evidence that "Eureka" would probably have not only peaceful but also military aspects. THE WASHINGTON POST reported a few days ago that, according to a Department of Defense spokesmen and European diplomats, the United States is about to sign agreements with the British and West German governments which would open the way for participation by European companies in research on the SDI program. If this is so, two questions inevitably arise. First: how can this be reconciled with the agreement by the same two countries to participate in the "Eureka" program and does this not provide a direct confirmation of plans to build "bridges" between the two programs? And the second and main question: What does the West expect from the arms limitation talks which envisage the prevention of the militarization of space?

To Geneva via Paris

The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Geneva will take place about a month after the Paris summit meeting. It is well known that, in response to our offer of a moratorium on nuclear tests, the Americans conducted tests of the ASAT system against a real target stationed in space. This is a bad way to prepare for a summit meeting. One would like to hope that, despite this and other actions aimed at hardening [uzhestocheniye] the situation, common sense will nevertheless prompt Washington to understand the need for reciprocal concessions and compromises for the sake of peace and arms limitation. The Europeans could have their say about the danger of violating the ABM treaty and abandoning SALT II and other agreements concluded in the seventies.

The greatest threat to peace today lies in the penetration of weapons into space. It is capable of destroying the fragile foundation on which security in Europe and throughout the world has been based for the last 25 years. The West considered that this foundation was provided by the concept of deterrence. An attempt is now being made to counter this concept with some kind of doctrine about "defense" against missile weapons, about the alleged possibility of creating [sozdat] an impenetrable shield by using lasers, quantum energy, or other means also deployed in space.

I have had the opportunity to attend many conferences devoted to this problem together with North American and West European representatives. The overwhelming majority of participants draw the inevitable conclusion: the new doctrine is either illusion or deception.

Let me note that similar thoughts are expressed increasingly often by official U.S. circles. The U.S. Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has prepared a report on the subject of "ballistic missile defense technology" at the request of the House of Representatives. The report notes that this problem gives rise to "more questions than answers"; that to guarantee the total defense of the U.S. population against a mass strike "is an impossible task"; and that the implementation of this program must proceed in such a way as "to reduce the probability of the Soviet Union deciding to deploy its own ABM defense." In other words, the report's authors admit that all arguments by SDI's opponents are well-founded. Furthermore, they also draw attention to the simplest of facts: this game cannot be played expecting that the other side will passively await its outcome, in other words ignoring the Soviet Union's countermeasures.

It is perfectly obvious that if the further unfolding [razvertyvaniye] of SDI does occur, this will have the most pernicious consequences for the entire arms limitation process. Additional hundreds of billions of dollars will be expended and new types of weapons with unheard-of consequences will be created [sozdany], while the vectors of security will plummet toward zero, destabilization of the military balance will occur, and fears and mutual suspicion will grow. And who knows, maybe at that time some madman will actually decide to gamble with the fate of all mankind....

But let us get back to Paris. In conclusion, I would like to recall traditions, some of which can be described as going back centuries. The Russian and Soviet people have long loved French culture, both past and present. We know that French people share the same feelings for our culture. It could be that these feelings of our peoples, profound mutual feeling for one another and the awareness of the indivisiblity of our cultures, contain the hopes for new prospects for bringing our two countries closer together for the sake of peace and prosperity.

GORBACHEV VISIT TO FRANCE EXPECTED TO BOOST TRADE

PM011315 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Sep 85 p 3

[Final part of G. Dadyants dispatch: "Before the Meeting in Paris"]

[Excerpts] Paris, Sep -- The vast plate glass and concrete architectural ensemble is a distinctive feature of the panorama of one of the oldest suburbs of Paris, St. Cloud. Industrial magnates, like medieval seigneurs, build to ensure that no one doubts their power.

I had half an hour to kill before my meeting with Mr Fischer, president of the Lurgi company, and it was pleasure to stroll through the old, narrow streets of the ancient suburb.

The Lurgi company has cooperated successfully with Soviet organizations for 8 years now. Together with the Penichey Group it took part in the construction of the aluminum complex at Nikolayev, it supplied equipment for a pesticide plant at Volgograd, and now, together with the (Litvin) company and a Canadian firm, it has signed a big contract for the development of the new Tengiz gas and oil deposit.

Daniel Fischer follows attentively what is now happening in the Soviet Union. On his desk are cuttings from French newspapers on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speeches, including his Tyumen speech.

We have taken as a compliment your leader's remark that the USSR must build its own equipment, which must not be inferior to Western equipment. That means that French equipment is good. French business circles are following the changes which are taking place in the USSR with great interest. Mr Gorbachev has an excellent grasp of economics. We are impressed by his dynamism. The fact that he is coming to Paris means that our relations are improving. I believe that as a result of this visit we will hit the gas pedal, as it were, because it will undoubtedly lead to an increase in our trade exchanges and to an expansion of technological cooperation...

What can I say about the shape of our trade and economic ties with France at the moment? The Soviet trade mission in Paris supplied me with figuers. The commodity turnover has more than doubled over the last 5 years in comparison with the preceding 5-year period.

We import machines, equipment, and metallurgical industry goods (primarily high-grade steel), food products, and a number of consumer goods from France.

And we sell France energy raw materials, that is oil and gas, chemicals, machines, and equipment. Soviet exports of machines and equipment to France total around R40-45 million annually. That is more than the exports of similar goods to the FRG or Italy, for instance.

Nonetheless -- and this is admitted by both the Soviet and the French side -- the potential for Soviet-French trade, economic, and industrial cooperation is by no means fully exploited.

The development of this cooperation would undoubtedly be promoted if questions of credit for French deliveries of machinery and equipment to the Soviet Union were resolved on a mutually advantageous basis. It must be borne in mind that credit terms are one of the most important factors which determine French firms' ability to compete.

There is no doubt that France is interested in the Soviet market. I visited USINOR, one of France's biggest metallurgical concerns, and talked to Mr Bouvet, the director general. The difficulties which the West European metallurgical industry is currently experiencing in connection with the decline in demand and the quotas introduced by the Americans on steel deliveries from EEC countries are well known. USINOR, SACILOR, and other West European metallurgical concerns are forced to close down modern plants, regroup, modernize production, and dismiss workers. USINOR, for instance, his lost around 10,000 jobs in recent years. The sector's losses run into billions. In these circumstances the importance which is being attached to Soviet purchases of UNSINOR'S products is understandable. After all, according to Mr. Bouvet's estimates up to 10 percent of USINOR'S steel output is now exported to the USSR. A special shop for the production of large-diameter pipes ordered by the USSR has been built at Dunkerque.

For USINOR, as Monsieur Bouvet said, this is a promising business. The Soviet Union represents a huge market and we have great trust in our Soviet partners and are prepared to ensure the highest quality deliveries within the necessary deadlines. We are pleased that Mr. Gorbachev is coming to Paris. Good political relations favor economic ties because, as experience has shown, the more favorable the political climate, the better the business.

Replying to our question up to what point political dialogue at summit level can promote the development of Soviet-French economic and industrial ties, Jean-Daniel Gardere, director general of the French foreign trade center and vice president of the Franco-Soviet Chamber of Commerce said:

Together with all French industrialists I am hoping that the upcoming meetings will give a strong impetus to exchanges of goods and services between our countries.

The leaders of the USSR and France are meeting at a very crucial stage in the development of international relations and of scientific and technical progress, which is also important. It is to be hoped that after this meeting the USSR and France will travel the same road, the road of strengthening peace, mutual understanding,and multifaceted cooperation and will contribute toward a change for the better in international affairs.

PRESS DECRIES BEIRUT KIDNAPPINGS; DOCTOR KILLED

'Heinous Crime'

PM021045 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Oct 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Criminal Act"]

[Text] Moscow, October 1 TASS -- A heinous crime was committed in Beirut. Bandits from one of the arch-reactionary ultra right-wing organizations seized as hostages four officials working in Soviet agencies in Lebanon. As a condition for their release the terrorists advance demands connected with the operations of the warring Lebanese groupings in the area of the city of Tripoli. The life of the hostages is in jeopardy.

This terrorist act of abduction of Soviet citizens comes as a gross violation of international law. Like all terrorist activities, it demands resolute condemnation by the Soviet and world public.

The competent Soviet agencies are taking all necessary steps in order to save the Soviet citizens.

Diplomats Identified

LD011046 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1002 GMT 1 Oct 85

["Pool" item]

[Text] Beirut, Oct 1 (QNA) -- Gunmen kidnapped three Soviet diplomats and a doctor working at the Soviet Embassy in Beirut Monday [30 September]

The sources said the diplomats were abducted at about 1 pm (1000 GMT) in two cars shortly after they left the embassy. The embassy refused to comment on the kidnapping, the first to involve Soviet diplomats since the beginning of the Lebanese civil war in 1975.

Police identified the Soviet diplomats as Second Secretary Valeriy Mirnakov, Commercial Attache Oleg Spirin, Cultural Attache Arkadiy Katakov and embassy physician Nikolay Svirškiy.

Envoy Meets Al-Jumayyil

NC021638 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] President Amin al-Jamayyil received Soviet Charge d'Affaires (Yuriy Suslikov) at 1600 today. Their meeting lasted 30 minutes and the charge d'affaires did not make any statement when it was over. We have learned that the meeting took place at the president's request following the kidnapping of four Soviet diplomats.

The Soviet charge d'affaires told the president what he knew about the incident. He also handed him a message from the Soviet Government on this subject. President Al-Jumayyil declared the Lebanese Government denounces and condemns this incident. He explained the state is doing what it can to end this episode and secure the release of the four diplomats.

President Al-Jumayyil informed the Soviet charge d'affaires that the Army command has designated two officers from its intelligence service to remain at the Soviet Embassy. They will stay with Soviet diplomats, who are following up the investigation into the incident in coordination with the security forces. President Al-Jumayyil also asked Nabbi Birri, minister of state for the South and reconstruction, who is in Damascus, to help determine the whereabouts of the kidnapped diplomats.

Physician Killed

NC021214 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 2 Oct 85

[Text] It has transpired that the Soviet citizens who was killed by three bullets was Nikolay Svirskiy. He was the Soviet Embassy doctor.

A source said that a Soviet Embassy delegation went to the autopsy room of the American University of Beirut hospital to identify the body.

It has also transpired that the second body found in Tariq al-Jadidah today belonged to Fadi Jawhar, who was born in Kayfun in 1965. He was killed when a wall collapsed over his head.

Further Reportage

For reportage on the kidnapping of four diplomats from the Soviet Embassy in West Beirut, see the Lebanon section of the 30 September Middle East & Africa DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

ISRAELI PLANES BOMB PLO'S TUNIS HEADQUARTERS

LD011152 Moscow TASS in English 1148 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] New York, October 1 TASS -- Six Israeli planes bombed the headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Organisation in the southern suburb of the Tunisian capital, AP news agency has reported from Tunis.

According to the news agency, fires broke out in the area of the city which was bombed by the Israeli aircraft. Fire trucks and ambulances rushed to the scene.

KHAMENE'I SHARES HOPE FOR BETTER RELATIONS

LD011650 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1613 GMT 1 Oct 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] A telegram addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet has arrived from Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in which he expressed thanks for the congratulations on his reelection to the post of president and noted that he shares the hope expressed by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for the development of relations between the USSR and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

IMPROPER USE OF STATE VEHICLES RESULTS IN WASTE

LD171329 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 17 September carries a 7-minute feature presented by Galina Vinogradova on waste and losses resulting from inefficient road transportation methods. Vinogradova begins by saying the following:

"Probably most of you, comrades, have had occasion more than once to see a picture like the following: Powerful trucks rush along the roads with not a thing on board. As the saying goes, carrying nothing but air. Or a driver nips home in his dump truck during working hours for a bite to eat. Ten kilometers or so there and back -- nothing to speak of. Yet these empty journeys and these unofficial trips in works vehicles all add up to thousands of tons of fuel which are squandered and essentially stolen from the state pocket. Perhaps the most unpleasant and most damaging aspect of this is that where the heads of vehicle enterprises close their eyes to violations of this sort, the drivers also develop an indifferent attitude to social property and a feeling of impunity arises."

Next, Maya Agibayeva reports from Dzhambul Oblast State Vehicle Inspection, where she witnessed a raid by inspectors and the People's Control Committee. Truck drivers with empty trucks were found dropping children off at a kindergarten and shopping at stores to buy cigarettes; one driver, asked why he was driving an empty truck 70 km between his loading point and destination, said: "We always do it like that."

Naimanov, deputy head of the Kazakhstan State Vehicle Inspection, cites instances of trips of up to 1,000 km which drivers make with empty trucks. Cases have come to light where more resourceful truck drivers will find themselves a cargo: Five trucks, for instance, were apprehended on the Alma-Ata-Chimkent route and found to be carrying vegetables and cucurbits from Alma-Ata to a small village en route. The drivers, of course, pocketed the cash.

Naimanov says: "I should like to remind people that the State Vehicle Inspection Service strictly punishes drivers who turn state transportation into a source of personal enrichment and profit. Since the start of the current year, the State Vehicle Inspection has discovered on the roads of the Republic and nipped in the bud a total of over 19,000 cases of using state transport for unofficial purposes with the aim of making a profit."

He notes that the Kazakhstan Ministry of Motor Transportation has a special service for freight delivery to destinations using vehicles already making that particular journey, but the service does not operate properly. It should be an inter-industry service available to individual citizens as well. For some years, such a system has been operating between Alma-Ata and Taldy-Kurgan with trucks taking on vegetables to deliver to the capital. He concludes that the whole issue of wasted fuel and working time involved in empty trucks being used should be resolved at ministerial and departmental level.

DELAYS PREDICTED IN SOVIET OIL TO WEST

AU011105 Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG in German 1 Oct 85 p 7

[Text] In the near future there will again be major delays in Soviet oil deliveries to the West. Oil industry circles are assuming that the Soviets might even cancel contracted deliveries altogether.

Dealers with relevant contacts believe that Moscow will maintain deliveries only to the East Bloc countries, while it will plead force majeure toward all other customers.

There were similar delivery difficulties regarding Soviet oil early this year, but at that time they were obviously caused by the weather. Regarding the reasons for the now expected difficulties, there are two versions: On the one hand, there is talk about supply bottlenecks in the USSR; on the other hand, it is regarded as possible that it might be a deliberate maneuver designed to keep oil prices high.

REGULATIONS ON INCENTIVES FOR CONSUMER OUTPUT

PM251024 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 14 Sep 85 p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "In Ministries and Departments": "Incentives for Consumer Goods"]

[Text] Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, and the AUCCTU have adopted a regulation on incentives for increasing production of consumers goods, fulfilling the set targets for the production of these goods per ruble of the wage fund, and improving their quality.

This regulation comes into force on 1 January 1986. Enterprises and associations for which consumer goods are not the main products are being encouraged to increase their output, calculated as an increasing total compared to the actual level of that indicator in the previous year. If the enterprise or association produces dual-purpose products, that is for production and technical needs and for sale to the population, then extra funds can only be allocated to the material incentive fund if the plan is fulfilled and an increase in overall output is ensured. Collectives for whom consumer goods production is the main type of activity are being encouraged to increase output of top-quality goods or new goods of improved quality.

Extra funds for the material incentive fund are being allocated on a normative basis -- one percent of the planned fund for every percentage (point) increase in production of consumer goods calculated per ruble of the wage fund. If the plan target for this indicator is overfulfilled the allocations are increased accordingly, and if the target is underfulfilled they are reduced similarly. If the collective fulfills the counterplan, the extra allocations are increased 50 percent.

The regulation establishes that if consumer goods production per ruble of the wage fund is increased compared with the previous year's level, the source of the extra allocations is the planned profits, and if that indicator is exceeded with the annual plan, the source is the above-plan profits. Moreover, enterprises and associations which have shifted to normative distribution of profits can allocate these funds out of the above-plan profits before their distribution.

In what cases may extra incentive funds not be allocated? When contractual deliveries and the production plan have not been fulfilled or when the plan has been overfulfilled on the basis of goods whose above-plan output is not permitted.

One other condition affecting all manufacturers of consumer goods is established: The extra allocations may not exceed one-fourth of the planned material incentive funds.

What is the system for awarding bonuses to workers? Enterprise and association leaders are awarded quarterly bonuses of 5 percent of the monthly salary for every percent or point of actual increase in consumer goods production per ruble of the wage fund. The system and size of incentives for other workers is established by the enterprise or association leader in agreement with the trade union committee.

Bonuses for leading workers of enterprises producing dual-purpose products are paid if overall production is increased. The main criterion for awarding bonuses to leaders of enterprises for which consumer goods production is the main type of activity is improvements in output quality. For every point of actual increase in the proportion of top-quality category goods or goods with the "N" index, they can obtain 5 percent of the monthly salary per quarter.

The regulation points out that first, these bonuses are paid regardless of other work results and on top of the maximum size of bonuses established for corresponding categories of workers. Second, the system of holding bonus funds in reserve is not extended to this type of bonus. Third, the maximum bonus for a worker cannot be more than his monthly salary (basic wage rate) per quarter.

Ministry and department leaders can deprive leading workers of enterprises and associations of bonuses if there are unsold (nonsaleable) consumer goods in their depots or in the trade network. They can do the same if they receive complaints about their products.

Ministries and departments are permitted to use differentiated normatives -- up to 25 percent of those established -- for allocations to the material incentive fund and differentiated sizes of bonuses for leading workers of enterprises and associations depending on the complexity of production.

In order to interest workers of scientific research institutes and design bureaus in the development of high-quality consumer goods designs, enterprises and associations have the right to allocate up to 10 percent of their additional funds as incentives for them.

AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION SESSION REVIEW

PM271411 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 27 Sep 85 p 1

[TASS report: "Agro-Industrial Commission Session"]

[Text] On 25 September a session of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Commission on Questions of the Agro-industrial Complex heard a report by P.A. Paskar, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan, on the work being done to improve investment policy in the development of the agro-industrial complex in accordance with the instructions given at CPSU Central Committee Conferences on questions of accelerating scientific and technical progress and of the party and economic aktiv in the city of Tselinograd.

The commission spoke approvingly of plans by the USSR Gosplan and ministries and departments of the agro-industrial complex to increase in the 12th 5-year Plan the proportion of capital investments and material and technical resources used to resolve provlems associated with increasing production of new highly productive equipment, mineral fertilizers, plant protection agents, and feed protein; carrying out the modernization of irrigation and drainage systems; and accelerating the creation of a base for the storage and processing of agricultural products. The measures which have been elaborated to accelerate construction in the countryside of hard-surfaced internal farm roads, well-appointed apartment blocks, children's preschool establishments, clubs, libraries, trade enterprises, and other cultural and consumer projects were evaluated positively. Corresponding targets are provided for in the draft "Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and for the Period Through the Year 2000."

A report on the measures being taken in the Uzbek SSR and the Armenian SSR to accelerate the transition to receiving livestock and milk directly on the farms and dispatching them on transport provided by the procurement workers was delivered by B.R. Rakhimov and V.M. Movsisyan, deputy chairmen of those republics' councils of ministers.

The commission drew the attention of agro-industrial associations to the unutilized reserves and potential in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decision on the question. The material and technical base for these purposes is being created only slowly in the republics and the available specialized transport and equipment are underutilized.

The Uzbek and Armenian SSR Councils of Ministers were instructed to take additional measures to complete the transition to receiving livestock and milk directly on farms in the 12th 5-Year Plan.

There was comprehensive discussion at the commission of the progress in preparing kolkhozes and sovkozes for the wintering of livestock. It was pointed out that this work is being carried out in a more organized manner this year. Farms will be better supplied with coarse and succulent feed and with machinery and equipment for its rational utilization. The standard of livestock care and veterinary work on kolkhozes and sovkhozes has risen.

At the same time, the commission drew attention to the shortcomings that exist in the preparations for livestock wintering. On certain farms root corps, mixed silage, and other feed which reduced consumption of grain for forage purposes are being procured at a slow pace. In the Ukrainian SSR, the Uzbek SSR, the Kirgiz SSR, and the Tajik SSR there have been delays over commissioning livestock premises, silage and haylage structures, storehouses for grain forage, and other projects envisaged by the plan for 1985.

In the Kazakh SSR and a number of regions of the RSFSR, particularly in Irkutsk, Korov, and Vladimir Oblasts, a large number of feed shops have still not been repaired.

In January-August a number of enterprises of the Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, and the Ministry of the Chemical Industry failed to supply agriculture with a large quantity of machinery, equipment, and timber and other materials essential for the needs of livestock raising.

The union republic council of ministers presidium commissions for questions of the agro-industrial complex, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the USSR Ministry of Fruits and Vegetable Farming, and the USSR State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture have been given instructions to take measures to eliminate shortcomings in the preparation of kolkhozes and sovkhozes for livestock wintering. Special attention must be devoted to the full provision of all farms with coarse, succulent, and other types of feed and its rational utilization. The task has been set of achieving a significant reduction in grain consumption for forage purposes by making extensive use of mixed silage, corn with cobs of waxy and milky-waxy ripeness, food waste, and by-products from the dairy, meat, and food industries to feed livestock. In all livestock units, complexes, and poultry farms measures must be implemented as quickly as possible to fully staff them with stockmen cadres and to create appropriate working conditions.

Selkhoztekhnika enterprises are called upon to ensure the efficient organization of work on the technical servicing of machinery and equipment in livestock units and complexes, poultry farms, and feed shops and on providing them with spare parts and repair and operational materials.

PROCUREMENT OF FEED CROPS AHEAD OF 1984 LEVEL

PM250935 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 21 Sep 85 p 2

[M. Glinka agricultural review: "Replenishing Feed Stocks"]

[Excerpt] The USSR Central Statistical Administration has reported that the country's kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and interfarm enterprises have procured approximately 72 million metric tons of hay and more than 73 million metric tons of haylage -- 113 percent of last year's level. Some 146 million metric tons of silage has been obtained and 6.3 million metric tons of artificially dehydrated green feed produced. Harvesting of feed root crops and melon crops has begun and 2.3 million metric tons of them have been procured. Overall stocks of coarse and succulent feed exceed 104 million metric tons of feed units -- 8 percent more than had been procured by this time last year. Stocks of this feed per standard head of livestock are also higher than last year's level.

Considerably more haylage than last year has been laid down in the majority of union republics. Its procurement plans have been overfulfilled in the RSFSR, Belorussia Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Moldavia, Kirgizia, Tajikistan, Armenia, Turkmenia, and Estonia. Farms in Belorussia, Lithuania, Moldavia, and Lativia have exceeded the hay procurement targets. Work is proceeding at a fast pace by the silage trenches. Procurement of such a valuable feed as mixed silate has been expanded in many parts of the country this year. As the experience of progressive farms has shown, it not only makes it possible to replace part of the grain concentrates in hog rations but also has a beneficial effect on the animals' health and improves herd reproduction.

GEN IVANOVSKIY INTERVIEWED ON TANK TROOPS DAY

PM170944 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Sep 85 First Edition p 2

[Unnamed own correspondent interview with hero of the Soviet Union Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of the ground forces and USSR deputy defense minister: "Motherland's Steel Shield; Today Is Tank Troops' Day" -- date and place unspecified]

[Text] On the eve of the holiday, hero of the Soviet Union Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of the ground forces and USSR deputy defense minister, replied to a PRAVDA correspondent's questions.

Question: This year the Soviet people are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascist Germany and the 40th anniversary of the rout of militarist Japan and the end of World War II. Please tell us something about the contribution made by Soviet tank troops to the victory.

Answer: I would recall that the tank troops' traditional holiday was established by a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 11 July 1946 to mark the outstanding services of Soviet armored and mechanized troops in routing German fascism and Japanese militarism as well as the services of fatherland tank builders in creating first-class examples of armored equipment.

Soviet tank troops fought bravely against the enemy who had invaded our soil. Even in the border regions the Hitlerites felt the force of our armored troops. Considerable losses were inflicted on the attacking Hitlerite tank groupings by, for instance, the counterstrikes by our mechanized formations commanded by Generals A. Kurkin, N. Shestopalov, and S. Oborin near Shyaulyay, Brest, and Grodno. And the largest encounter battle of the initial period of the war took place near Dubno, Lutsk, and Rovno. The fierce fighting between the enemy's tank grouping and the mechanized corps of the south-western front lasted several days. As a result the fascist troops' offensive was halted and our command won time to prepare new defensive salients.

There is much evidence that in the first 3 weeks of the war the fascists lost one-half of their tanks on our soil. Their manpower losses were considerable. In 2 months of fighting their losses were double what the Hitlerites had suffered in 2 years of combat actions in Europe. The Soviet tank troops conquered the enemy not with numbers but with skill. The feat of General T. Mishanin and Colonel I. Vasilyev is well known. Boldly attacking a full-strength Hitlerite mechanized corps, the tank troops pursued the fascists for 10 km and took the hamlet of Leshiyevo on the move. Incidentally, that was on the 5th day of the war.

The Soviet tank guards were born in the battle of Moscow. At that time three tank brigades were awarded the honored title. One of them was commanded by Colonel M. Katukov, subsequently marshal of armored troops.

The combat potential of Soviet tank troops was seen most fully in offensive operations. Operating, as a rule, at the spearhead of salients of advancing armies, the tank troops broke the enemy front with a resolute splitting strike and drove into the enemy rear, creating the conditions for surrounding and completely routing him. This was the case during the battles of Stalingrad and Kursk, the Korsun-Shevchenkovskiy and Wisla-Odra operations, and the battles for Berlin and Prague.

It was also the case when tank units made their legendary crossing of the great (Khingan) and the Gobi desert and totally routed Japan's Kwangtung Army.

I, as a person who spent the entire war as part of the armored troops, want to stress that at the front our tanks were the best and they were taken into battle by courageous servicemen utterly devoted to the motherhood, and the motherhood worthily marked their heroism. Hundreds of thousands were awarded orders and medals and more than 1,000 soldiers, sergeants, officers, and generals became heroes of the Soviet Union. Sixteen of the most fearless frontline tank troops won this title twice. Many tank units and formations received combat orders and honored titles. All 6 of our tank armies and 12 tank and 9 mechanized corps had become guards by the end of the war.

Question: What influence has postwar scientific and technical progress had on the development of armored equipment?

Answer: The most typical directions in the postwar development of Soviet tank equipment have been increasing its maneuverability, the power and effectiveness of its arms, and improving other combat qualities.

The legendary T-34, the world's best medium tank in World War II, cannot, of course, be compared either externally or in terms of its equipment to modern machines. They reflect the latest achievements of electronics, optics, radio engineering, mechanics, chemistry, and the power industry. For instance, high-quality observation and firing instruments make it possible to drive tanks under any conditions and hit the target in limited visibility.

The main demand made on modern armored equipment boils down to the effectiveness of its utilization in combat actions both in conventional warfare and under conditions of enemy use of nuclear weapons. Our tanks are capable of fighting under such conditions. Their technical equipment makes it possible for them to successfully carry out rapid moves, conduct offensives day and night, and overcome zones of obstacles and destruction and major water obstacles.

Question: What demands does such a rapid development of technology make on tank troop servicemen?

Answer: Service in the tank troops has traditionally attracted and continues to attract young Soviet people. Many young people on the threshold of army service express a desire to become tankmen.

This is, of course, a very, very praiseworthy desire. But I would also like to give one piece of advice. Service in the tank troops must be prepared for thoroughly and, if possible, in advance.

In order to assimilate a modern tank and fully utilize the combat potential inherent in it, it is necessary to have solid knowledge in the field of physics, mathematics, electronics. Among tank troops it has become a norm dictated by the demands of modern warfare for a tank commander, for instance, to be able not only to lead the crew skillfully and with initiative but to be also trained to personally carry out the combat tasks and drive the tank. If necessary the gunner is always ready to take the place of the commander, just as the driver is prepared to replace the gunner.

Servicemen are well aware that a modern tank is a collective weapon. On tactical exercises and maneuvers tank troops persistently study precise, coordinated operations that show initiative. They are helped in this by firm skills in the operation of equipment, moral, psychological, and physical tempering, boldness, and resoluteness.

All this does not come automatically to tank troops. Their high qualities are shaped in the training and education process and the entire structure of army service, but primarily by the specific and purposeful party political work of commanders, political organs, and party and komsomol organizations.

Question: In the present complex international situation it is more important than ever to maintain the country's defense capability at the proper level. How are Soviet tank troops improving their combat and political training under these conditions?

Answer: Soviet tank troops, like all Ground Forces personnel, are successfully resolving the tasks of the summer training period, which is now in full swing. Their daily concern is to further increase the combat readiness of each subunit, unit, and formation.

We are inspired by the fact that the party and people make a high assessment of military labor and emphasize its necessity. "We will continue to spare no effort," it was noted at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, "to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces have everything necessary for the reliable defense of our fatherland and its allies and that nobody catches us unawares."

Intensive military labor is currently in full swing on firing ranges, tank training areas, and training fields. Under the leadership of their commanders the tank troops are learning to skillfully drive their mighty machines on all terrains, day and night, to hit their target on the move and after a short stationary period with the first shell and first round at the limit of their range, and to operate skillfully and swiftly in conditions as close as possible to real battle conditions. The tank company commanded by Captain V. Konnov, for instance, is well known in the Red Banner Belorussian Military District. Day in, day out, the servicemen are increasing their efforts in the struggle for high-quality exercises and the excellent fulfillment of each combat training task. The tank company commanded by Captain A. Pecherskiy from the Order of Lenin Transbaykal Military District is also distinguished by combat cohesion. I would like to spotlight the servicemen of the Yu.V. Andropov Order of Lenin Red Banner Kantemir Guards Tank Division. Here the movement to drive the combat machines and fire tank arms as heroes of the Soviet Union Junior Lieutenant V. Yermolayev, Sergeant A. Timofeyev, and other hero tank troops raised in the division did is alive and expanding with every passing year.

The servicemen of the tank regiment from the group of Soviet Forces in Germany in which Major V. Ovchinnikov serves, the tank troops of the company from the Order of Lenin Leningrad Military District commanded by Captain A. Mikryukov, and many others are greeting the current holiday with high indicators.

The socialist competition to worthily greet the 27th CPSU Congress is a tried and tested way of increasing the activeness and initiative of servicemen. A firm base for the successful completion of the current academic year has been laid in the course of the competition in honor of the 40th anniversary of the great victory.

The tank troop servicemen serving as part of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in the DRA are carrying out their patriotic and international duty as true and worthy sons of the socialist motherland. They are showing courage, heroism, and selflessness in carrying out training and combat tasks. Senior Lieutenants R. Mugatalliyev and N. Sorokin, Lieutenant A. Znobyshev, Sergeant A. Adaygudishev, and Junior Sergeant V. Lyubeznov are serving in different units but they are all united by a high sense of responsibility for the exemplary fulfillment of their military duty.

Tank troop servicemen, like the entire personnel of the ground forces and the other branches of the Soviet Armed Forces, are vigilantly guarding Soviet people's peaceful labor.